THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM

A SURVEY OF THE PRESENT POSITION

BY
HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL BOURNE
ARCHBISHOP GERMANOS, D.D., D.PH.
RIGHT REV. OTTO DIBELIUS, D.D.
ARCHBISHOP SÖDERBLOM, D.D., PH.D., D.C.L., M.D.
RIGHT REV. F. T. WOODS
REV. A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
REV. J. SCOTT LIDGETT, M.A., D.D.
VERY REV. A. MARTIN, M.A., D.D.
RIGHT REV. WILLIAM T. MANNING, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.
PROF. W. ADAMS BROWN, PH.D., D.D.
REV. T. A. MOORE, D.D.
RIGHT REV. VEDENAYAKAN AZARIAH, LL.D.
REV. W. E. ORCHARD, M.A., D.D.

EDITED BY
SIR JAMES MARCHANT, K.B.E., LL.D.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
BX 8 .A1 M3

NEW YORK
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

COPYRIGHT, 1929,
BY
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, INC.

PRINTED IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

EDITOR'S NOTE

Each writer is responsible for his own essay.

J. M.

SEMINARY LIBRARY

CONTENTS

PAGE

PROLOGUE ix

THE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC ROMAN CHURCH . . 3

By HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL BOURNE, *Archbishop of Westminster, Introducing an Encyclical on "Fostering True Religious Unity" by* HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XI.

THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH 31

By THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP GERMANOS, D.D., D.Ph., *Metropolitan of Thyateira, Exarch of Western and Northern Europe.*

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN GERMANY . . 61

By THE RIGHT REV. OTTO DIBELIUS, D.D., *General Superintendent of the Kurmark, Germany.*

THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN 83

By THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP SÖDERBLOM, D.D., Ph.D., D.C.L., M.D., *Archbishop of Upsala, Pro-Chancellor of the University.*

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND 107

By THE RIGHT REV. F. T. WOODS, *Lord Bishop of Winchester.*

THE FREE CHURCHES IN ENGLAND 135

By THE REV. ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., *Principal of New and Hackney College, Deputy Chairman of the Lausanne Conference.*

THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH . . . 161

By THE REV. J. SCOTT LIDGETT, M.A., D.D., *Ex-Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, Ex-President of Wesleyan Methodist Conference.*

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHURCH UNION IN SCOTLAND 185
By THE VERY REV. ALEXANDER MARTIN, M.A., D.D., *Principal of New College, Edinburgh.*

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES AND ITS RELATION TO THE MOVEMENT FOR REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM . . 211
By THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM T. MANNING, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., *Bishop of New York.*

THE CHURCHES OF THE UNITED STATES . . . 233
By PROFESSOR WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, Ph.D., DD., *Union Theological Seminary, New York.*

THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA 259
By THE REV. T. ALBERT MOORE, D.D., *Secretary of the General Council of the United Churches of Canada.*

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN INDIA 281
By THE RIGHT REV. VEDENAYAKAN AZARIAH, LL.D. (Cantab.), *Lord Bishop of Dornakal.*

A VISION OF THE REUNITED CHURCH . . . 303
By THE REV. W. E. ORCHARD, M.A., D.D.

PROLOGUE

When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?

And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets.

He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am?

And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

Matt. xvi:13-19.

These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee:

As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.

And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.

And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.

I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word.

Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee.

For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.

I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.

And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them.

And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are.

. . . . . .

As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.

And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.

Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word;

That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one:

I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.

. . . . . .

And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.

JOHN xvii.

Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.

And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.

Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles?

Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?

But covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet shew I unto you a more excellent way.

I Cor. xii:27-31.

For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;

Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace;

And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:

And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.

For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God;

And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone;

In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord:

In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

Eph. ii:14-22.

I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called,

With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love;

Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling;

One Lord, one faith, one baptism,

One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.

Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

(Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?

He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)

And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers;

For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ:

Till we all come in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:

That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive;

But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ:

From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.

EPH. iv:1-16.

That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.

EPH. v:27.

THE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC ROMAN CHURCH

THE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC ROMAN CHURCH

By His Eminence Cardinal Bourne
Archbishop of Westminster

The Encyclical Letter *Mortalium Animos* which follows is a re-affirmation of the traditional doctrine of the Catholic Church, rendered necessary by the many endeavors made in recent years to bring about a united Christendom. Those efforts have failed, as such efforts must always fail, because they leave out of account the very definite teaching and tradition of the Church founded by Jesus Christ.

There is indeed a fundamental difference between Unity as understood by the average Protestant mind and Unity in the Catholic's conception of that term. In the case of the Protestant, Unity is something which has probably never existed; which certainly does not exist to-day; which may, perhaps, be realized in some far-off future by a compromise between contending and even contradictory opinions. To a Catholic such a conception of Unity is not only repugnant but quite impossible. He believes that Unity has existed from the day when Christ established His Fold and set up His Church, comparing it to a kingdom and a house; that from that day the Church has

had a visible organic unity, which, because it is divinely constituted and divinely protected, can never be broken. In the exercise of their free will men may abandon it and be no longer within its range, but the Unity itself remains unbroken and unimpaired. Their abandonment cannot break or impair it. Like every healthy organism, that one Church possesses the vital faculty of rejecting and ejecting every element that menaces its vitality or organic unity.

Thus the company in the Upper Chamber on the day of Pentecost constituted the Unity of the one Church. A few days later the Church numbered some hundreds, and they were the *whole* Church, and the entire world without was outside the Unity of that one Church. Gradually the numbers grew to thousands, and to-day they are many tens of millions. But it is not a question of numbers or extent. The Church has, indeed, both the mission and the power of existing at all times and in every nation. In all probability her growth has been continuous from the beginning. Loss in one direction has been more than compensated by gain in some other. But the existence of the one Church and her Unity are independent of time and place and numbers.

The Catholic holds that this conception of the Unity of the Church is the necessary logical consequence of the Divine Founder's words. She accepts them in their natural literal sense. "As the Father

has sent Me, so do I send you." "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be condemned." "Thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." When, too, the Founder spoke of the sheep outside the Fold, He showed clearly that the Fold existed actually and was no mere dream of the future. Into that Fold all were gradually to be gathered; and then, eventually, all mankind would be one Fold under the Shepherd: but, until they are gathered in, they are outside the Unity of the one Fold, outside the visible organic Unity of the Catholic Church.

It is clear that the Unity of the Catholic Church was thus understood from the earliest days of Christianity. Those were within the Unity who, being baptized, accepted the teaching and submitted to the authority of the Church. All others were regarded as outside the Unity. Baptism was the gate of entry. To reject the teaching once accepted was to become a

heretic and to be treated as such. To throw off the authority of the Church was an act of schism incurring the punishment thereof. And the Church claimed then, as she claims to-day, to have power to declare and set forth the revelation of truth entrusted to her by her Founder, and to be divinely protected against error in such authoritative declaration or setting forth.

This is the conception of Unity held by every Catholic, a Unity which has existed from its constitution by Christ Himself, and is to exist in virtue of His promise until the end of time. All those who accept this idea of Unity are within the visible unity of the one Church; those who reject that idea are outside the Unity, and can enter within only by accepting the teaching and authority of that Church founded by Christ our Lord. Any other conception of Unity is tantamount to admitting that the promises of Christ have failed so far as His Church is concerned; and is a virtual denial of the divine origin of that Church.

Another point stands out clearly from this Catholic conception of Unity. If Christ has actually given a clear, definite revelation of truth about God and His relation to His creatures, and has promised that that revelation shall continue to the end of the world, and be safeguarded against error, it follows that every creature who becomes convinced of the reality of that revelation is bound to accept it, and commits sin if he refuses to accept it. If God the Creator speaks, the

creature is bound to listen and to believe what He utters. Hence the axiom "outside the Church there is no salvation." But, as it is equally true that without the deliberate act of the will there can be neither fault nor sin, so evidently this axiom applies only to those who are outside the Church knowingly, deliberately, and wilfully.

And this is the doctrine of the Catholic Church on this often misunderstood and misrepresented aphorism. There are the covenanted and the uncovenanted dealings of God with His creatures, and no creature is outside His fatherly care. There are millions—even at this day the vast majority of mankind—who are still unreached or unaffected by the message of Christianity in any shape or form. There are large numbers who are persuaded that the old covenant still prevails and are perfectly sincere and conscientious in their observance of the Jewish Law. And there are millions who accept some fashion of Christian teaching who have never adverted to the idea of Unity as I have described it, and have no thought that they are obliged in conscience to accept the teaching and to submit to the authority of the Catholic Church. All such, whether separated wholly from acceptance of Christ and His teaching, or accepting that teaching only to the extent in which they have perceived it, will be judged on their own merits. They are bound to accept and follow God's teaching so far as their reason rightly used shall lead them.

They must obey the dictates of the moral law which their conscience imposes upon them. They must regret before God, and endeavor to undo, the faults and sins that they commit against their reason and their conscience. And they are bound at all cost to enter within the Unity of the Church so soon as they realize that that obligation is incumbent upon them.

When or how such realization may come to them no one can say. To what extent they may attain it is the secret of God. But this is certain, that no man of really good will is ever rejected by his Maker, and that to every soul is offered *real opportunity* of salvation. None can be lost, whether within or without the visible Unity of the Church, except by his own deliberate fault. A conscious neglect of prayer, which is Christ's own appointed means of finding truth, evidently involves fault on the part of him who in doubt does not seek from God in prayer the removal of his perplexity. "Ask, and you shall receive; seek, and you shall find."

Meanwhile the external work of the Church must always continue, for Christ the Founder has so willed and ordained it: "Go, and teach all nations." He Himself used human means and instruments to accomplish His divine purpose, and He uses them still. The Gospel will spread slowly and gradually, dependent for its extension on frail, changeable, and mortal men, on human means of transport, and on the concurrence of various human factors. It is often

hampered, checked, and thwarted by the resistance of human wills. But just as our Master did not hesitate to say, "I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do," when the Passion was yet to come, and to human eyes the work of redemption seemed hardly yet begun, so may we in all reverence and humility claim that our work is accomplished when we have done our best to carry out that Master's will in our regard, and have striven to obtain His pardon for all that we have left undone or done amiss. And all men must surely labor and hope and pray that in God's own time every human creature may be gathered into that Unity which is undoubtedly according to His will. And it is their duty, whether they be already within or still outside that Unity, by brotherly love and mutual helpfulness and the uprightness of their lives, but without compromise of truth, to hasten the coming of that day.

It is this conception of Unity which also explains why the Catholic Church, in accordance with the tradition of Christianity from the beginning, declines to participate in the worship of those who do not accept her teaching and authority, and refuses to admit them to her Sacraments. To act otherwise would, in her judgment, be disloyalty to her Founder and to the truth which He has given into her care. Worship, to be acceptable, must be sincere and based on truth. Convinced that she possesses divinely revealed truth, she would be acting disloyally and in-

sincerely were she, by participation in their worship, to seem to admit that those who think that this divinely revealed truth is uncertain and still awaiting discovery and proof are, perhaps, after all in the right, while she has been deceived. She is fully persuaded that in her worship of God she is dealing with truth, reality, and fact. She is essentially unable to regard Divine worship as a matter of opinion, sentiment, or uncertainty. Thus Catholics, while respecting the religious convictions of others and acknowledging their sincerity and good faith, are precluded from any action that would appear to call in question the objective truth of the revelation delivered to her by Jesus Christ our Lord. She must ever be, as she has been from the beginning, an *exclusive* Church both in her teaching and in her worship.

This, then, is the unchanging and unchangeable teaching of the Catholic Church on Unity, which the actual occupant of the Papal Chair authoritatively proclaims once more in terms that are quite clear. They are inspired solely by apostolic zeal for the accomplishment of the Master's purpose, and by most earnest desire that all men may be brought to His Sacred Feet in loving acceptance of the truth which He has taught.

Encyclical Letter of Our Most Holy Lord Pius XI by Divine Providence Pope on "Fostering True Religious Unity"

Pope Pius XI to his Venerable Brethren gives Greeting and the Apostolic Benediction.

Never perhaps in the past have the minds of men been so engrossed as they are to-day with the desire to strengthen and extend for the common good of mankind that tie of brotherhood—the result of our common origin and nature—which binds us all so closely together. The world does not yet fully enjoy the fruits of peace; on the contrary, dissensions old and new in various lands still issue in rebellions and conflict. Such disputes, affecting the tranquil prosperity of nations, can never be settled without the combined and active goodwill of those who are responsible for their government, and hence it is easy to understand—especially now that the unity of mankind is no longer called into question—the widespread desire that all nations, in view of this universal kinship, should daily find closer union with one another.

It is with a similar motive that efforts are being made by some in connection with the New Law promulgated by Christ our Lord. Assured that there exist few men who are entirely devoid of the religious sense, they seem to ground on this belief a hope that all nations, while differing indeed in religious matters, may yet without great difficulty be brought to fra-

ternal agreement on certain points of doctrine which will form a common basis of the spiritual life. With this object congresses, meetings, and addresses are arranged, attended by a large concourse of hearers, where all without distinction, unbelievers of every kind as well as Christians, even those who unhappily have rejected Christ and denied His divine nature or mission, are invited to join in the discussion. Now, such efforts can meet with no kind of approval among Catholics. They presuppose the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy, inasmuch as all give expression, under various forms, to that innate sense which leads men to God and to the obedient acknowledgment of His rule. Those who hold such a view are not only in error; they distort the true idea of religion, and thus reject it, falling gradually into naturalism and atheism. To favor this opinion, therefore, and to encourage such undertakings is tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God.

Nevertheless, when there is a question of fostering unity among Christians, it is easy for many to be misled by the apparent excellence of the object to be achieved. Is it not right, they ask, is it not the obvious duty of all who invoke the name of Christ to refrain from mutual reproaches and at last to be united in charity? Dare anyone say that he loves Christ, and yet not strive with all his might to accomplish the desire of Him Who asked His Father that

His disciples might be "one" (John xvii:21)? Did not Christ will that mutual charity should be the distinguishing characteristic of His disciples? "By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for another" (John xiii:35). If only all Christians were "one," it is contended, then they might do so much more to drive out the pest of irreligion which with its insidious and far-reaching advance is threatening to sap the strength of the Gospel. These and similar arguments, with amplifications, are constantly on the lips of the "pan-Christians" who, so far from being a few isolated individuals, have formed an entire class and grouped themselves into societies of extensive membership, usually under the direction of non-Catholics, who also disagree in matters of faith. The energy with which this scheme is being promoted has won for it many adherents, and even many Catholics are attracted by it, since it holds out the hope of a union apparently consonant with the wishes of Holy Mother Church, whose chief desire it is to recall her erring children and to bring them back to her bosom. In reality, however, these fair and alluring words cloak a most grave error, subversive of the foundations of the Catholic faith.

Conscious, therefore, of Our Apostolic office, which warns Us not to allow the flock of Christ to be led astray by harmful fallacies, We invoke your zeal, Venerable Brethren, to avert this evil. We feel confident that each of you, by written and spoken word,

will explain clearly to the people the principles and arguments that We are about to set forth, so that Catholics may know what view and what course of action they should adopt regarding schemes for the promiscuous union into one body of all who call themselves Christians.

God, the Creator of all things, made us that we might know Him and serve Him; to our service, therefore, He has a full right. He might indeed have been contented to prescribe for man's government the natural law alone, that is, the law which in creation He has written upon man's heart, and have regulated the progress of that law by His ordinary Providence. He willed, however, to make positive laws which we should obey, and progressively, from the beginnings of the human race until the coming and preaching of Jesus Christ, He Himself taught mankind the duties which a rational creature owes to his Creator. "God, Who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days hath spoken to us by His Son" (Heb. i:1, *seq.*). Evidently, therefore, no religion can be true save that which rests upon the revelation of God, a revelation begun from the very first, continued under the Old Law, and brought to completion by Jesus Christ Himself under the New. Now, if God has spoken—and it is historically certain that He has in fact spoken—then it is clearly man's duty im-

plicitly to believe His revelation and to obey His commands. That we might rightly do both, for the glory of God and for our own salvation, the only-begotten Son of God founded His Church on earth. None, we think, of those who claim to be Christians will deny that a Church, and one sole Church, was founded by Christ.

On the further question, however, as to what in the intention of its Founder was to be the precise nature of that Church, there is not the same agreement. Many of them, for example, deny that the Church of Christ was intended to be visible and manifest, at any rate in the sense that it was to be visibly the one body of the faithful, agreeing in one and the same doctrine under one teaching and governing authority. They conceive the visible Church as nothing more than a federation of the various Christian communities, even though these may hold different and mutually exclusive doctrines. The truth is that Christ founded His Church as a perfect society, of its nature external and perceptible to the senses, which in the future should carry on the work of the salvation of mankind under one head, with a living teaching authority, administering the sacraments which are the sources of heavenly grace (John iii:5, vi:48-59, xx:22 *seq.;* cf. Matt. xviii:18, etc.). Wherefore He compared His Church to a kingdom (Matt. xiii), to a house (cf. Matt. xvi:18), to a sheepfold (John x:16), and to a flock (John xxi:15-17).

The Church thus wondrously instituted could not cease to exist with the death of its Founder and of the Apostles, the pioneers of its propagation; for its mission was to lead all men to salvation, without distinction of time or place: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations" (Matt. xxviii:19). Nor could the Church ever lack the effective strength necessary for the continued accomplishment of its task, since Christ Himself is perpetually present with it, according to His promise: "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii:20). Hence not only must the Church still exist to-day and continue always to exist, but it must ever be exactly the same as it was in the days of the Apostles. Otherwise we must say—which God forbid—that Christ has failed in His purpose, or that He erred when He asserted of His Church that the gates of hell should never prevail against it (Matt. xvi:18).

And here it will be opportune to expound and to reject a certain false opinion which lies at the root of this question and of that complex movement by which non-Catholics seek to bring about the union of Christian Churches. Those who favor this view constantly quote the words of Christ, "That they may be one. . . . And there shall be one fold, and one shepherd" (John xvii:21, x:16), in the sense that Christ thereby merely expressed a desire or a prayer which as yet has not been granted. For they hold that the unity of faith and government which is a note

of the one true Church of Christ has up to the present time hardly ever existed, and does not exist to-day. They consider that this unity is indeed to be desired and may even, by coöperation and goodwill, be actually attained, but that meanwhile it must be regarded as a mere ideal. The Church, they say, is of its nature divided into sections, composed of several churches or distinct communities which still remain separate, and although holding in common some articles of doctrine, nevertheless differ concerning the remainder; that all these enjoy the same rights; and that the Church remained one and undivided at the most only from the Apostolic age until the first Œcumenical Councils. Hence, they say, controversies and long-standing differences, which to-day still keep asunder the members of the Christian family, must be entirely set aside, and from the residue of doctrines a common form of faith drawn up and proposed for belief, in the profession of which all may not only know but also feel themselves to be brethren. If the various Churches or communities were united in some kind of universal federation, they would then be in a position to oppose resolutely and successfully the progress of irreligion.

Such, Venerable Brethren, is the common contention. There are indeed some who recognize and affirm that Protestantism has with inconsiderate zeal rejected certain articles of faith and external ceremonies which are in fact useful and attractive, and which the

Roman Church still retains. But they immediately go on to say that the Roman Church, too, has erred, and corrupted the primitive religion by adding to it and proposing for belief doctrines not only alien to the Gospel but contrary to its spirit. Chief among these they count that of the primacy of jurisdiction granted to Peter and to his successors in the See of Rome. There are actually some, though few, who grant to the Roman Pontiff a primacy of honor and even a certain power or jurisdiction; this, however, they consider to arise not from the divine law but merely from the consent of the faithful. Others, again, even go so far as to desire the Pontiff himself to preside over their mixed assemblies. For the rest, while you may hear many non-Catholics loudly preaching brotherly communion in Jesus Christ, yet not one will you find to whom it ever occurs with devout submission to obey the Vicar of Jesus Christ in his capacity of teacher or ruler. Meanwhile they assert their readiness to treat with the Church of Rome, but on equal terms, as equals with an equal. But even if they could so treat, there seems little doubt that they would do so only on condition that no pact into which they might enter should compel them to retract those opinions which still keep them outside the one fold of Christ.

This being so, it is clear that the Apostolic See can by no means take part in these assemblies, nor is it in any way lawful for Catholics to give to such enter-

prises their encouragement or support. If they did so, they would be giving countenance to a false Christianity quite alien to the one Church of Christ. Shall we commit the iniquity of suffering the truth, the truth revealed by God, to be made a subject for compromise? For it is indeed a question of defending revealed truth. Jesus Christ sent His Apostles into the whole world to declare the faith of the Gospel to every nation, and, to save them from error, He willed that the Holy Ghost should first teach them all truth. Has this doctrine, then, disappeared, or at any time been obscured, in the Church of which God Himself is the ruler and guardian? Our Redeemer plainly said that His Gospel was intended not only for the apostolic age but for all time. Can the object of faith, then, have become in the process of time so dim and uncertain that to-day we must tolerate contradictory opinions? If this were so, then we should have to admit that the coming of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, the perpetual indwelling of the same Spirit in the Church, nay, the very preaching of Jesus Christ, have centuries ago lost their efficacy and value. To affirm this would be blasphemy. The only-begotten Son of God not only bade His representatives to teach all nations; He also obliged all men to give credence to whatever was taught them by "witnesses preordained by God" (Acts x:41). Moreover, He enforced His command with this sanction: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that be-

lieveth not shall be condemned" (Mark xvi:16). These two commands, the one to teach, the other to believe for salvation, must be obeyed. But they cannot even be understood unless the Church proposes an inviolate and clear teaching, and in proposing it is immune from all danger of error. It is also false to say that, although the deposit of truth does indeed exist, yet it is to be found only with such laborious effort and after such lengthy study and discussion, that a man's life is hardly long enough for its discovery and attainment. This would be equivalent to saying that the most merciful God spoke through the prophets and through His only-begotten Son merely in order that some few men, and those advanced in years, might learn what He had revealed, and not in order to inculcate a doctrine of faith and morals by which man should be guided throughout the whole of his life.

These pan-Christians who strive for the union of the Churches would appear to pursue the noblest of ideals in promoting charity among all Christians. But how should charity tend to the detriment of faith? Everyone knows that John himself, the Apostle of love, who seems in his Gospel to have revealed the secrets of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and who never ceased to impress upon the memory of his disciples the new commandment "to love one another," nevertheless strictly forbade any intercourse with those who professed a mutilated and corrupt

form of Christ's teaching: "If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God speed you" (II John 10).

Therefore, since the foundation of charity is faith pure and inviolate, it is chiefly by the bond of one faith that the disciples of Christ are to be united. A federation of Christians, then, is inconceivable in which each member retains his own opinions and private judgment in matters of faith, even though they differ from the opinions of all the rest. How can men with opposite convictions belong to one and the same federation of the faithful: those who accept sacred Tradition as a source of revelation and those who reject it; those who recognize as divinely constituted the hierarchy of bishops, priests, and ministers in the Church, and those who regard it as gradually introduced to suit the conditions of the time; those who adore Christ really present in the Most Holy Eucharist through that wonderful conversion of the bread and wine, transubstantiation, and those who assert that the body of Christ is there only by faith or by the signification and virtue of the sacrament; those who in the Eucharist recognize both sacrament and sacrifice, and those who say that it is nothing more than the memorial of the Lord's supper; those who think it right and useful to pray to the Saints reigning with Christ, especially to Mary the Mother of God, and to venerate their images, and those who refuse such veneration as derogatory to the

honor due to Jesus Christ, "the one mediator of God and men" (cf. I Tim. ii:5)?

How so great a variety of opinions can clear the way for the unity of the Church, We know not. That unity can arise only from one teaching authority, one law of belief, and one faith of Christians. But We do know that from such a state of affairs it is but an easy step to the neglect of religion or "indifferentism," and to the error of the modernists, who hold that dogmatic truth is not absolute but relative, that is, that it changes according to the varying necessities of time and place and the varying tendencies of the mind; that it is not contained in an immutable tradition, but can be altered to suit the needs of human life.

Furthermore, it is never lawful to employ in connection with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between "fundamental" and "non-fundamental" articles, the former to be accepted by all, the latter being left to the free acceptance of the faithful. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal motive the authority of God revealing, and this allows of no such distinction. All true followers of Christ, therefore, will believe the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the august Trinity, the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in the sense defined by the Œcumenical Vatican Council with the same faith as they believe the Incarnation of our Lord. That these truths have been solemnly sanctioned and

defined by the Church at various times, some of them even quite recently, makes no difference to their certainty, nor to our obligation of believing them. Has not God revealed them all?

The teaching authority of the Church in the divine wisdom was constituted on earth in order that the revealed doctrines might remain for ever intact and might be brought with ease and security to the knowledge of men. This authority is indeed daily exercised through the Roman Pontiff and the Bishops who are in communion with him; but it has the further office of defining some truth with solemn decree whenever it is opportune, and whenever this is necessary either to oppose the errors or the attacks of heretics, or again to impress the minds of the faithful with a clearer and more detailed explanation of the articles of sacred doctrine. But in the use of this extraordinary teaching authority no fresh invention is introduced, nothing new is ever added to the number of those truths which are at least implicitly contained within the deposit of Revelation divinely committed to the Church; but truths which to some perhaps may still seem obscure are rendered clear, or a truth which some may have called into question is declared to be of faith.

Thus, Venerable Brethren, it is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subject to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics. There is but

one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it; for from that one true Church they have in the past fallen away. The one Church of Christ is visible to all, and will remain, according to the will of its Author, exactly the same as he instituted it. The mystical Spouse of Christ has never in the course of centuries been contaminated, nor in the future can she ever be, as Cyprian bears witness: "The Bride of Christ cannot become false to her Spouse; she is inviolate and pure. She knows but one dwelling, and chastely and modestly she guards the sanctity of the nuptial chamber" (*De Cath. Ecclesiæ unitate*, 6). The same holy martyr marveled that anyone could believe that "this unity of the Church built upon a divine foundation, knit together by heavenly sacraments, could ever be rent asunder by the conflict of wills" (*ibid.*). For since the mystical body of Christ, like His physical body, is one (I Cor. xii:12), compactly and fitly joined together (Eph. iv:15), it were foolish to say that the mystical body is composed of disjointed and scattered members. Whosoever therefore is not united with the body is no member thereof, neither is he in communion with Christ its head.

Furthermore, in this one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize, and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors. Did not the ancestors of those

who are now entangled in the errors of Photius and of the Reformers obey the Bishop of Rome, the chief shepherd of souls? Their children, alas! have left the home of their fathers; but that house did not therefore fall to the ground and perish for ever, for it was supported by God. Let them, then, return to their Father, Who, forgetting the insults in the past heaped upon the Apostolic See, will accord them a most loving welcome. If, as they constantly say, they long to be united with Us and Ours, why do they not hasten to enter the Church, "the mother and mistress of all Christ's faithful"? (*Conc. Lateran,* iv. c. 5). Let them heed the words of Lactantius: "The Catholic Church is alone in keeping the true worship. This is the fount of truth, this the house of faith, this the temple of God; if any man enter not here, or if any man go forth from it, he is a stranger to the hope of life and salvation. Let none delude himself with obstinate wrangling. For life and salvation are here concerned, and these will be lost for ever unless their interests be carefully and assiduously kept in mind" (*Divin. Inst.* lv. 30, 11-12).

Let our separated children, therefore, draw nigh to the Apostolic See, set up in the City which Peter and Paul, Princes of the Apostles, consecrated by their blood; to the See which is "the root and womb whence issues the Church of God" (Cypr. *Ep.* 48 *ad Cornelium,* 3); and let them come, not with any intention or hope that "the Church of the living God, the pillar

and ground of the truth" (I Tim. iii:15), will cast aside the integrity of the faith and tolerate their errors, but to submit themselves to its teaching and government. Would that the happy lot, denied to so many of Our Predecessors, might at last be Ours, to embrace with fatherly affection those children whose unhappy separation from Us We now deplore. Would that God our Saviour, "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (I Tim. ii:4), might hear our humble prayer and vouchsafe to recall to the unity of the Church all that are gone astray. To this all-important end We implore, and We desire that others should implore, the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of divine grace, Help of Christians, victorious over all heresies, that she may entreat for Us the speedy coming of that longed-for day, when all men shall hear the voice of her divine Son, and shall be "careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. iv:3).

You, Venerable Brethren, know how dear to Our heart is this desire, and We wish that Our children also should know, not only those belonging to the Catholic fold, but also those separated from Us. If these will humbly beg light from heaven, there is no doubt but that they will recognize the one true Church of Jesus Christ, and entering therein, will at last be united with Us in perfect charity. In the hope of this fulfilment, and as a pledge of Our fa-

therly goodwill, We impart most lovingly to you, Venerable Brethren, and to your clergy and people, the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at S. Peter's, Rome, on the 6th day of January, the Feast of the Epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the year 1928, the sixth of Our Pontificate.

PIUS PP. XI.

THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

By The Most Rev. Archbishop Germanos, D.D., D.Ph.

Metropolitan of Thyateira, Exarch of Western and Northern Europe

I. The Orthodox Conception of Reunion

The Orthodox Church, inasmuch as it claims that in itself it shows the closest continuation of the ancient and undivided Church, cannot but approach the question of Reunion in the way that that Church approached it. Following the example of our Lord (John xvii:23), Who conceived of the Church as a communion of men bound to one another through faith in Him, the example of the Apostles, who speak of the Church as the "edifice of God, the corner-stone of which is Jesus Christ" (I Cor. iii:9, 10), and more especially that of the Apostle Paul, who regards the unity of the faith as the essential characteristic of the Church (Eph. iv:11-13), the ancient Church confessed in its Creed faith "in one Church." By this phrase the Church meant that that which constitutes an indispensable characteristic of this unity is a common faith; and it is the community of faith that from the very beginning it championed, against all heretics who denied or perverted the faith of the Church, and

who, by forming separate assemblies, jeopardized its unity. Since, therefore, the ancient Church bases its unity upon a common faith, it cannot in any way recognize the idea of an "external" unity of the Church—that is, of a unity under one person or one visible head.

Nevertheless, although the Orthodox Church believes that it is the true Church of Christ on earth in that it has faithfully abided by the Holy Gospel and Apostolic tradition, consecrated through the Mysteries ordained by our Lord and the Apostles, and led by shepherds in a direct unbroken line of succession from the Apostles themselves down to our own times, it in no way denies that God may show His mercy to those also who are outside the realm of His true Church. That is to say, the Orthodox Church admits that the saving grace of God is present among those Christians who are separated from it, when, as a necessary presupposition, certain indispensable conditions are observed. It is in this way that we may explain the fact that the ancient Church in its Œcumenical Synods accepted economically (*κατ' οἰκονομίαν*) as valid certain Mysteries celebrated by heretics or schismatics, and the fact that in quite recent times the Synod of Constantinople recognized that, besides the close unity in which the Orthodox Churches in all parts are bound to one another and in which they constitute one body, there exists another and a wider unity in which are included all Christian societies

which call on the name of the Lord. A view such as this, of those Christians who are outside the Church, naturally facilitates contact and *rapprochement*, on the part of the Orthodox Church, with such Christians, above all when there is at issue the advancement and achievement of the greatest of benefits to mankind, the Unity of the Church.

It must, however, in no way be supposed that the Orthodox Church can recognize a full and absolute Reunion, that is, a complete Communion in the Mysteries, in cases where agreement in faith does not exist. Such agreement in faith among the Christian world, and, as a necessary corollary, unity in the Church, it does not regard merely as an ideal towards which all Christians should, in the future, strive, but as an actuality which the first eight centuries of the Christian era witnessed, and which may again be witnessed if all devote themselves to its realization. According to the Orthodox conception, it is necessary that the ancient undivided Church should be taken as the pattern for a future Reunion of the Churches; it would, in addition, be provided that the Orthodox Church would not enforce upon others whatever might be regarded as a problem of a later period or one affecting only itself.

We have approached the question of the Reunion of the Churches from an Orthodox point of view, and have therefore considered it necessary to refer to the above questions in order that from the very first it

may be understood that it is only upon such a basis, i.e. of agreement in faith, that Reunion with the Orthodox Church can be regarded as valid and permanent. It would indeed be quite out of place to deduce, from the zeal which the Orthodox Church has shown and is showing in collaborating with the other Churches on ethical questions, that it could in the slightest degree swerve from the basis of its existence or admit any compromise regarding fundamental principles of faith. "In matters of faith there can be no compromise," said Marcus of Ephesus at the height of the debate with the Roman theologians at the Synod of Florence. The unanimous declaration of the Orthodox representatives at the last Conference at Lausanne, that they could not deviate from the faith of the ancient Church and accept a compromise, shows that the same spirit which from the beginning characterized Orthodoxy continues to hold sway to-day. Hence every attempt at Reunion, whencesoever it may come, cannot properly overlook this spirit nor cherish greater hopes than could be justified about a speedy Reunion with the Orthodox Church.

Following upon such views as these, this question may be put. Are we then to despair of the possibility of Reunion with the Orthodox Church? Before answering such a question, it is necessary for us to turn to the past and to consider what has been the outcome of the attempts at *rapprochements* between

the Christian world of the West and the Orthodox East.

II. Rome and the East

As is well known, the attempts made to resume the ties between the Roman and the Eastern Churches which had been severed in the ninth, and finally sundered in the eleventh, centuries, began not long after the rupture. The motive of these attempts was not, I hold, the consciousness of the great damage to the activity of the Church in the world occasioned by such a rupture of relations, nor even a pious desire for the reëstablishment of peace together with unity, but rather a motive having to do with human weakness and passions. By reason of the influence which the Byzantine political power had acquired and exercised over the Orthodox Church and its leaders, it was able to induce the Church to attempt to resume relations with the West, though merely from motives of political interest. The Byzantine Emperors were attracted by the thought that Reunion would bring with it the support of Rome and of Rome's allied hegemonies of the West in their desperate struggle to preserve the Byzantine State from the Islamic danger. Neither in the conscience of the clergy nor in that of the laity had the thought taken root that Reunion must be aimed at on account of the benefits that would thereby result both from a religious and an ethical point of view, that is, that Reunion should

be aimed at merely for what, in itself, it stood for. Hence the negotiations for Reunion were entrusted, on the Orthodox side, to political leaders and a particular class of clergy who, by reason of their subservience to, or flattery of, the Emperors were enabled to conduct such negotiations. It is well known, too, that even at the Synod of Florence, where the pretense of uninfluenced theological discussion was maintained, it was among other things imperial intervention which influenced the resultant pseudo-reunion; indeed, it was precisely because this Reunion had not the unanimous support of clergy and laity that it was declared invalid shortly after the return to Constantinople of the signatories.

But if the Byzantine Emperors welcomed attempts at Reunion with Rome on grounds of political expediency, the Popes of Rome did so on grounds rather of papal than of ecclesiastical interest. Already before the tenth century the Roman Church had, by a lengthy process, which it would be out of place to repeat here, traced the bases of the present-day monocracy in the government of the Church in contradistinction to the system prevailing in the ancient Church of patriarchal and synodical government. The Roman Church had succeeded in imposing this sovereignty over the whole of the West by reason of the fact that it was the only Apostolic Church in the West and that the peoples of the West owed their Christianization to it, and the Churches their organi-

zation. It turned its attention to the East also, and though here it failed in the realization of its schemes on account of the opposition of Photios and the other Patriarchs of Constantinople, and, more than that, brought about the Schism of East and West (A.D. 1054), yet it did not despair; on the contrary, it eagerly awaited every occasion for the extension of its dominion, and so willingly availed itself of the invitations from the Byzantine Emperors to enter into negotiations for Reunion. In these negotiations the matters for discussion were the questions of faith, in relation to which the East charged the West with following new paths of thought and with teaching what was contrary to Holy Gospel and Apostolic tradition, but the favorite subject to which Rome clung was the question of the Primacy of the Pope. These Reunion efforts ended in shipwreck—either through the cessation of negotiations or through the rejection, by one or other of the parties to it, of a forced pseudo-reunion.

After the enslavement of the Orthodox Church—or of its principal domain—attempts at Reunion between the Roman and Orthodox Churches were not resumed. Rome, however, continued to be occupied with the idea of Reunion. But in place of official negotiation or discussion between representatives of two Churches, coming together as equals, and as those who trace their succession back to the same stem, Rome prefers the method of individual con-

versions. It is to be regretted that this method has so far unhappily succeeded in delaying, it is said, the day of its Reunion with the Orthodox Church; for the latter was forced either to turn a deaf ear to the repeated invitations of Rome to Reunion or to reply calling on her to return to what the Orthodox Church holds to be the path from which she had swerved. As instances of this we may cite the replies given to Pope Pius IX in 1848 and to Leo XIII in 1897.

III. The Other West and the East

Though not, in the true sense of the word, negotiations but rather discussions and conversations, contacts of the Orthodox Church with the "other" West have been sought. The first contact, that made by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremias II, who had received intimation of the "Confessio Augustana" and the resultant discussions by means of letters on questions of faith, was broken off without either of the parties persuading the other of the justice of its views, but also without injuring the existing relations. The Patriarch Jeremias, who was the first to break off all correspondence on questions of faith as serving no useful purpose, made it clear at the same time that he would be ready in the future to receive and reply to letters from the theologians concerned which might have to do with their friendly relations or kindred subjects.

In the East the "Calvinistic Confession" of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucaris (A.D. 1631), aroused great hostility against Protestantism; by reason of the attacks made on it by the Jesuits, it was considered as undermining the very foundations of the Orthodox Church, although, in my own opinion, it was only an expression of the personal convictions of the Patriarch; he felt constrained to draw it up and sign it not for the benefit of his own flock, or, in general, of the East (for none realized better than Lucaris the shipwreck that awaited such an enterprise), but rather for those also in the West, who held the same views and afforded him their protection, of which he stood in great need in order to reply to the attacks of the Jesuits of the East and especially of Constantinople. This agitation continued for about a century, and as one of its consequences gave birth to a spirit of mistrust on the part of the Orthodox Church in Protestantism and removed the hope of any new contact in the near future, especially as the first of the Churches of the East was groaning under the burden of an intolerable enslavement.

A resumption of the relations between the non-Roman Christian world of the West and the East manifests itself in the eighteenth century. The Eastern Orthodox Church could not remain indifferent to the ecclesiastical movement which was called into being in the West as a result of the Vatican Synod

(1870); in effect, when invited to take part in the two Congresses organized by the Old Catholics in Bonn in 1874-5 under the presidency of the distinguished Professor J. Döllinger, it sent representatives not only from the Œcumenical Patriarchate but also from Russia and from Greece, and joined in the discussions with the Anglicans and the Old Catholics about the fundamental matters dividing the Churches. This contact, the first after so many years of division, did not, it is true, show such results as to justify the resumption, immediately after the Congresses, of negotiations for inter-communion between the participating Churches, but it did point out the path which ought to be followed by any attempt at Reunion with the Orthodox Church. Since that time the friendly relations between the Orthodox and the Old Catholic Churches have continually been strengthened, more especially in recent years through the medium of meetings between the theologians of the two Churches, as at Geneva in 1920 and at Lausanne in 1927.

Of even greater importance is the contact between the Orthodox Church and the Anglicans during the last quarter of the past and the first quarter of the present centuries. This period of relations was inaugurated by the Encyclical of Gregory VI (1869), in which he gave his sanction to the ecclesiastical burial of Orthodox by Anglicans and *vice versa*, without, however, going so far as to permit the members

of one Church to communicate in the other in times of need; this need was created by the increasing dispersal of the Orthodox, and especially of the Greeks, and by the lack of Orthodox clergy in remote parts of the globe. The clergy, however, of the Church of England evinced true brotherly feelings in showing themselves ready to afford the benefits of the Christian religion to the Orthodox, whenever these latter lacked the services of their own priests, by baptizing their children, officiating at their marriages, and even admitting to Holy Communion those of the Orthodox who desired it. When these facts came to the notice of the Orthodox ecclesiastical authorities, so far from calling forth any protests they earned their highest approval, inasmuch as it was known that the Anglicans had no ulterior motive of proselytism in these activities; they were indeed even willing in such circumstances to use the prescribed offices of the Orthodox Church. And though the Orthodox Church did not in this connection make any official decision, yet the ensuing recognition of the validity of the Anglican Orders (1922) greatly increased the probability of, and facilitated, such a decision in the future.

Likewise, a matter of great importance is the contact between the theologians of the two Churches during the last few years with the knowledge and approval of their respective leaders. On the occasion of the visit to America of the then Metropolitan of Athens (now Patriarch of Alexandria), Meletios,

accompanied by several theologians such as the present Archbishop of Athens, Chrysostom, and Professor Alivisatos, discussions took place between them and representatives of the Episcopal Church of America on questions which divide the two Churches (1917). These discussions were afterwards continued in London between the same Orthodox theologians and members of the Anglican Church, while delegates from Serbia and Rumania likewise entered into discussions of the same nature with the Anglicans. The resultant conclusions were, on the one hand, the confirmation of the latent agreement between the two Churches on many of the points of discussion, and on the other the clarifying and illumination of the existing differences.

Later, the invitation from the Archbishop of Canterbury to take part in the Lambeth Conference (1920) and the sending by the Synod of Constantinople of a delegation under the Metropolitan of Didymoteichon, Philaretos, which entered into discussions with one appointed by the Lambeth Conference, not only contributed to the illumination of the questions under discussion, but also still further strengthened the relations between the two Churches. In this way the question of Reunion with the Orthodox Church has, thanks to the initiative of the Anglicans, been placed on the proper basis, that is, on a basis of friendly contact and discussion, the forerunner of a future agreement and Reunion. It is in

the light of this initiative to which it corresponds that we must consider the Encyclical of the Œcumenical Patriarchate of 1920, on Agreement and Collaboration of the Churches, though its scope, in that it is directed to all the Churches of Christ, is wider.

IV. The Encyclical of the Œcumenical Patriarchate (1920)

The immediate purpose of this Encyclical is undoubtedly to invite all the Churches that call on the name of Christ to stretch out a friendly hand to one another, to come to an agreement on questions which concern the whole Christian world, and to collaborate sincerely for the purpose of averting from the Christian body all the dangers which, though existing before, have assumed an even greater impulse since the war. And indeed this purpose is behind the measures which the Encyclical suggests for the removal of the existing mistrust between the Churches by means of the suppression of proselytism and the substitution of love between the Churches manifesting itself in mutual tolerance, in interest in the condition and fortunes of sister Churches, and in willingness to bring help to one another in case of need. And all that the Encyclical added as likely to show the existence of such a friendly disposition, such as the more frequent meeting between representatives

of the different Churches, contact between theological schools and their professors, the convocation of Pan-Christian Congresses to consider questions of common interest, the unbiased and historical examination of dogmatic differences, not only from the chair, but also in theological tractates, the mutual reverence for prevailing habits and practices in each Church—all these things are nothing but preliminaries of such agreement and collaboration.

But, besides, this Encyclical, characteristic of the broad attitude of the Orthodox Church towards the other Churches, is a proof of the methods by which, in time, may be advanced and effected the Reunion of the Churches in faith. According to the Encyclical, this constant contact and relation between the Churches, which it aptly calls "League of the Churches," will not only benefit each of the Churches and the whole Christian body through coördination of their activities and through mutual assistance, but will also contribute "to the preparation and facilitating of that hoped-for complete Reunion which, with God's help, may some day be brought about." For the Encyclical does not overlook the fact that long-standing convictions and persuasions, which have so often nullified the work of Reunion, may reappear to invalidate the disposition towards Reunion, if the Churches were at once to begin the work and enter upon negotiations for Reunion. The long experience of the past persuaded the Œcu-

menical Patriarchate that an attempt at immediate success in this work without preliminary preparation would clearly bring with it a danger of disaster. The best preparation is mutual acquaintance and esteem, which is only possible by means of continuous contact and collaboration on questions of a more general, that is of an ethical and social, nature.

It may therefore easily be understood why the Orthodox Church welcomed the Conference of Stockholm (1925) with such joy and hope, and was represented at it by the Patriarch of Alexandria and many other prelates and priests, and why it continues to collaborate, in so far as its special circumstances allow, with the other Churches on the Committee appointed by the Conference to consider further and put into effect its decisions. The subjects which occupied the attention of that Conference, whether ethical or social or international, are of such a nature as of necessity to presuppose, as their basis, the Christian teaching. But this teaching does not bear a character specifically identified with any one of these Churches, but has rather a general and truly Christian character in it. And if, by chance, on some points there appears a difference of opinion, such difference is settled through the medium of all the parties.

This does not mean that the Orthodox Church refuses to enter into discussion on questions of faith when invited to do so, but merely that it will not

take the initiative in instituting such discussions, because it regards the work as not yet fittingly prepared. But as a proof of its true Christian spirit it has agreed to discuss questions of faith either in special conversations with Anglicans or in more general conferences, as the preliminary one at Geneva and more especially the one at Lausanne "On Faith and Order" (1927). And at the first, but more so at the second, the representatives of the Orthodox Church perceived from the widely developed views expressed on each subject the distance that separates them from their brother-Christians in spite of the common points of agreement. For this reason they decided first of all not to swerve from the original bases to which the Orthodox Church has, from the beginning, kept in its attempts at Reunion; and secondly, to revert to the proposal contained in that Encyclical—that is, that there must be a long preliminary agreement and collaboration between the Churches.

But another thing must be mentioned. The magnitude of the Conference, which was composed of nearly all the Churches on earth except the Roman Church, lessened, in the opinion of the Orthodox, the probability of agreement between the different representatives. According to their view, for the work which mainly occupied the Conference of Lausanne, that is, the exposition and definition of common points of interest in the subjects under discussion between the different Churches, there was no need

either for such a vast gathering of representatives or for the representation of so many Churches; what was rather needed was the meeting of representatives of the principal Churches and of those Churches which were nearest to each other in teaching. Hence the Orthodox delegation finally expressed the hope that, before the attempt at general Reunion be undertaken, the attention of the friends of Reunion might be turned to reunion between Churches of a like outlook, so that such partial reunions might serve as the basis of complete Reunion. The approval which this declaration met with at the hands of the Orthodox Churches shows that the representatives acted in accordance with the convictions of the Churches which delegated them.

From what we have already said, it is clear that a spirit of reserve inspires the Œcumenical Patriarchate and the Orthodox Church in general, as regards the task of complete and final Reunion. To what is this due?

V. The Obstacles to Immediate Reunion

A. *External Obstacles*

The Encyclical of the Œcumenical Patriarchate imposes as the first and necessary condition of friendly agreement and collaboration between the Churches the removal of all mistrust and bitterness between them, such as is provoked by the tendency of some

of them to proselytize followers of other Churches. In order to confirm its assertions, the Encyclical does not refer to what happens, in this regard, in the West or beyond the Ocean, but merely recalls the state of affairs in the East. There the attempted Christianization of those who are already Christians by the Churches of the West and especially by the Roman Church provokes such animosity and hostility that if such proselytism continues, there can be no thought of Reunion. Indeed, as we mentioned above, since Rome has understood that all its attempts at Reunion have hitherto failed, it has directed its chief attention to individual conversions from the Churches of the East, and above all from that of the Orthodox Church.

A recent visit to the East gave me the explanation why, for example, the Orthodox Church of Antioch, that is, a Church of immense historical importance, is the most restrained in the discussions on Reunion and why it has been represented at none of the so-called "Conferences on Reunion." It is merely because it struggles to preserve its flock from such proselytism. The increase in the proselytizing activities of Rome in the East, especially since the war, is apparent to all those who have followed the measures recently adopted by the Roman Catholics to secure the financial resources necessary to the success of their work. And what is happening in Syria is happening also in Palestine, in Egypt, and in the

Balkan countries, and still more strenuously in the regions which were formerly Galicia and the Russian frontiers, where for many centuries a struggle has been carried on for supremacy between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism. The manner in which the Roman Catholics devote themselves to care for Russian refugees, and bring over to Roman Catholicism the younger ones among them and prepare and educate them for the attack on Orthodox Russia as soon as circumstances permit, and the schemes that are formulated with this end in view—all these things are known to and disliked by the Orthodox world, and naturally do not incline the Orthodox favorably towards the work of Reunion.

And though nothing, in this connection, could be charged against Anglicanism and Protestantism in Europe, the same cannot be said about some of the American Protestant Communions, who by one means or another seek to proselytize the Eastern Orthodox and thereby create mistrust in the definite assurances of a true desire for Reunion. The reserve and mistrust of the Orthodox Church in the work of Reunion will, we maintain, only be removed when a stop is put to Catholic and Protestant proselytism.

To the external obstacles to Reunion must be added the condition in which some of the Orthodox Churches find themselves in consequence of the World War. No one is ignorant of the critical posi-

tion of the Russian Orthodox Church following on the institution of the Bolshevik régime. After witnessing persecution and sacrilege, and martyrdom in the persons of its bishops and priests, it is now struggling to keep alive, and so long as it continues without external organization it cannot of course think about reunion with the non-Orthodox. And even if it had such a thought, the Orthodox Church could not initiate any activities of that nature, since they would merely arouse the suspicions of the political authorities and add new names to the list of its martyrs. Of what significance is the absence of the Russian Orthodox Church from any such task of Reunion, and how much this absence influences the position of the whole Orthodox Church, may easily be conceived if we take into account the fact that the center of importance of Orthodoxy, on the count of population, lies in Russia. In this way also is explained the hesitation shown to call a Pan-Orthodox or Œcumenical Synod in the East, inasmuch as the great Orthodox Church of Russia could not be represented at such a conference.

B. *Internal Obstacles*

But the internal condition also of the Orthodox Churches is not such as to enable their attention to be directed exclusively to the work of Reunion with the other Churches. Even in cases where their na-

tional dreams were fulfilled by the war, and they have seen brothers and compatriots reëstablished within their boundaries, they have not yet overcome the difficulties resulting from the effected national reunion. Problems of internal organization and assimilation regarding the sections added to the established national Church, the struggle to ensure the financial resources necessary if the Church is to advance and fulfil its high mission in the world, the campaign against ideas destructive of all ethical and social order which have taken root more especially since the war, the responsibility of ensuring the proper training along new lines of the clergy, too long neglected, in order that they may have the necessary influence over the people—all these and other problems of the same nature are occupying the attention of the Orthodox Church in the East to the almost complete exclusion of external questions.

The Reunion of the Churches, however much its importance is recognized and remembered in the daily prayers of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches, is not what primarily occupies their attention. It is right and just that everyone should, before all else, order his own house. And if especially we take into account how far behindhand the Orthodox Churches are in correcting what is not well ordered on account of their long slavery and the conditions in which till now they existed, it is easily understood that such a reorganization will be a process demanding a long

time. And from the point of view of reunion with others it is obvious how necessary is such internal reorganization. For only when the people come to a realization of the true religious life and are fully conscious of the great evil which comes from dissension and division is there hope of its seeking and achieving Reunion; only when the whole Christian body in conscience follows its spiritual leaders in the movement for Reunion is it possible for the effected Reunion to be permanent. It is far preferable that Reunion should be delayed than that, being hurriedly achieved, it should finally result in a new and irremediable division.

But to the reserve of the Orthodox Church another motive contributes—the internal composition of the Orthodox Church to-day. As is known, the Orthodox Church has, in its government, always followed the system of so-called autocephalous Churches, a system which has its origin in a long historical process, established by the Apostles and consecrated by the practice of the Œcumenical Synods. The Orthodox East, even after the schism of the autocephalous Church of Rome, preserved the system of the self-governing Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and the Archiepiscopate of Cyprus under the presidency of the first. All these autocephalous Churches were within the boundaries of the Eastern Byzantine State, whilst the geographical boundaries of each of these Churches were defined not on ethno-

logical grounds, which, owing to the commixture of races in the Eastern State, was impossible, but rather on grounds of regional administration.

The history of the rise of these Churches (except that of Jerusalem, which was weighed down by purely religious questions) points to this clearly; and even when the three Patriarchates—of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—came under the Arab sovereignty, the ties of these Churches with the See of Constantinople were not broken, thanks to agreements made with the Arab Khalifs by the Byzantine Emperors. Consequently throughout the period before the Fall of Constantinople, agreement between these Churches on any question common to their faith or government was a matter of little or no difficulty, the more so as the other autocephalous Churches, on account of the exceptional circumstances in which they found themselves, willingly recognized the right of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to act in their name and on their behalf. This condition of affairs continued even after the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, when the three Patriarchs of the East spent the greater part of their time in Constantinople and joined in the deliberations and decisions of the Synod at Constantinople, whenever there was a question of a general nature or one affecting the faith.

But this state of affairs as sketched above was altered from the moment when the Slavic nations

which had been christianized by Byzantium began to claim and obtain for themselves independent autocephalous Churches. Russia was the first to open the way when, after joining Kieff to Moscow politically, it obtained its ecclesiastical independence, and, in 1582, a separate Patriarchate recognized by the four other Patriarchs of the East. Russia's example was followed by the nations which were gradually freed, Greece, Serbia, Rumania, and, in recent years and under special conditions, Bulgaria and Poland, with the result that in place of the five original autocephalous Churches all situated in the Byzantine State, to-day they number ten. No one certainly can, in principle, assail this system, inasmuch as it conforms to ancient tradition and to the principle that prevails in the Orthodox Church: "ecclesiastical things are wont to be transformed together with political things." And if we take into account the fact that the Church more easily attains its object when its government is entrusted to clergymen who have the same national character and language, the same customs and practices, this apparent division of government constitutes a real tribute to the Orthodox Christian peoples.

But we must not, at the same time, overlook the disadvantages of the system, especially as regards the external outlook of the Church and its relations with the other Churches, which are divided from it. However much the Œcumenical Patriarch is recognized

as possessing the authority to undertake any combined activity, yet the local Orthodox Churches preserve their complete independence, and may refuse to participate in what he proposes as of interest to the Orthodox Church. By what means this incompleteness of the system will be remedied in such a way that the Union of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches as now existing, while respecting the independence of each, may create some organ to represent and to act for all of them, is a question which will be put forward and will find its solution in the next Pan-Orthodox Synod. Until this is done, however, the lack of a unified representation will constitute a serious obstacle to the achievement of Reunion with the other Churches.

Conclusion

From the above a conclusion may easily be drawn regarding the attitude of the Orthodox Church towards the question of its Reunion with the other Christian Churches. The Orthodox Church is greatly distressed by the division which Christianity exhibits, split up, as it is, into many Churches distinct from, and at enmity with, each other, and is inspired by the desire to collaborate in the reëstablishment of the longed-for Reunion. By this Reunion it does not, in keeping with the tradition it has always safeguarded, understand anything but unity in faith as

the ancient undivided Church understood it, and it is in the content of the faith of the ancient Church that it perceives the basis and the pattern which shall serve for any future Reunion. The obstacles are in the first place the existing dogmatic differences, which show a different conception of the Divine Revelation in different Churches; in the second place there are also the preconceptions and the misunderstandings which have underlain the long-standing separation and widened the chasm between the Churches.

Up till now the Churches have done nothing else but accentuate and magnify the slightest difference arising from the special characteristics or historical evolution of each Christian people. This method has been proved wrong and as tending to widen rather than to close the breach that separates the Churches from one another, and must for that reason be replaced. Dogmatic differences must assuredly form the subject of research and discussion in the future, but such an inquiry must be conducted by historical methods, in a spirit of sympathy and goodwill, in order that one may enter into the mode of thought of others and so realize the source and origin of each difference. More frequent meetings between theologians of different Churches and unimpassioned theological discussion will smooth out the path, which will bring the Churches nearer to unity in faith.

But simultaneously, or even preferably before,

there should be a preliminary *rapprochement* and collaboration on what constitutes the common ground of all Christian Churches without exception; together with this collaboration there should show itself a closer friendliness and a keener interest in the prosperity and well-being of these Churches and a clear proof that the relationship of the Churches actually does correspond to the relationship of the members of the body of Christ; in St. Paul's words: "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it" (I Cor. xii:26). Up till now the road to unity may be described as the road from faith to love. The road which we must go along in the future is the road from love to faith. "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity" (I Cor. xiii:13).

When the bond of love binds the Churches firmly to one another, then increase of faith and unity in faith will follow.

But agreement and collaboration presuppose the removal of these obstacles, external and internal. Instead of the Churches of the East being considered, as is customary, as representative of an inferior Christianity, and their subjection to an imaginary and more perfect type of Christianity being sought, it is far preferable that the West should probe deeper into the study of the Orthodox Churches and to discern what, owing to its circumstances, is

obscured in its essential life. Above all, let not the present-day conditions of the Orthodox Church be forgotten, conditions which place it not at the end but at the beginning of its evolution towards the newer and contemporaneous religious life. Bearing this in mind, let the Churches of the West interpret accurately the reserve of the Eastern Orthodox Church towards the question of Reunion, and let them remain steadfast in the hope that the near future may dispel this reserve, and that through its participation in the work our Lord's prayer, "that they may be one," may the sooner be fulfilled.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN GERMANY

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN GERMANY

By The Right Rev. Otto Dibelius, D.D.,
General Superintendent of the Kurmark, Germany

I

The divisions of German Protestantism are of another kind and have other roots than have the divisions in other countries of the Christian Occident. Out of the Religious Wars of the sixteenth century arose the principle, "Cujus regio ejus religio." The religious authorities, into whose hands the responsibility for ecclesiastical life was being concentrated even before the Reformation, had to decide which religious form should prevail in their countries. That only one religion should have influence was taken for granted at that time.

In this way the political divisions of Germany were made the basis for Church organization.

Unlike France and England in the Middle Ages, Germany was not one united State. The "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation" but loosely bound together the many large and small States then existing in Germany. Many ecclesiastical principalities, therefore, existed in Western and Central Germany. There were some large and ever-broad-

ening State structures as represented by the Habsburg and Brandenburg Electors. But there were also, as in Western Germany, numberless little counties, Principalities, and Free States. To each of these small Principalities, the principle "Cujus regio ejus religio" was applicable. Territories that remained Roman Catholic were a part of that old and great Church, although it is true that the influence of their clerical sovereigns on foreign soil was very limited. But in so far as they were Protestant, a binding link was almost completely lacking. In ecclesiastical matters the different reigning Princes could rule as their desires dictated.

After the Thirty Years' War the conception of tolerance began gradually to make itself felt. Religious minorities were tolerated. There were States whose rulers were Lutheran, but whose subjects were Roman Catholic—and *vice versa*. Calvinists were tolerated in Lutheran countries, and in Calvinist territories Lutherans were permitted to build their own churches. The principle of tolerance, however, did not prevail equally everywhere. The Electors of Brandenburg were the first to set a good example, and gradually others followed.

The absolute power of the ruling Princes, however, developed simultaneously in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Thirty Years' War ruined the middle classes. All power was concentrated in the hands of the nobility and the Princes. In eccle-

siastical life they were the absolute rulers. The consciousness that clerical matters were different from political matters slowly expired. The ruling Prince was *summus episcopus* within his own territory. The various clerical administrations of the different territories were hardly in contact with each other. During the French Revolution the ecclesiastical divisions of Germany reached their highest point.

It would not really be correct to say that there were two hundred different Churches in Germany at that time. By "Church" was meant that invisible body of which the *Confessio Augustana* spoke in Article VII: "The Church is a gathering of all believers who preach the true gospel and administer the holy sacraments." One can only say that the Protestant Church of Germany fell under one to two hundred different administrations. The most important part of the clerical organization was the separate parish. Those separate parishes were financially and legally as independent as they could possibly be. They were compelled to live from their own incomes. The highest authority on whom the pastor was dependent was, together with the parish, his patron. Ecclesiastical authorities who had the clerical administration in their hands were not altogether lacking. But they exercised little influence. In so far as the separate parishes could not be sovereign, they were dependent, not upon the clerical, but upon State authorities.

Then began the period of unification and concentration; but the political divisions of Germany continued to furnish the basis of Church organization. *The driving force behind unification was not ecclesiastical, but political developments.* Divisions of political territory became less frequent, and there was a conscious effort toward concentration. For instance, the territory of Nassau was formed from the Principality of Dillenburg, the county Solms, the Walramschen territories, the Principality of Dietz, the county of Katzenellenbogen, the county Saym, the Government of Beilstein, and the Principality of Hadamar. With each conclusion of peace, smaller territories were absorbed in larger ones. Swedish Hither-Pomerania was united with Prussia. Ansbach and Bayreuth were joined to Bavaria. Württemberg and Baden absorbed a large number of small Principalities. The strong fist of Napoleon struck dozens of small secular territories from the map. The clerical Principalities disappeared. Of the Free Cities, only Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck remained. The map constantly became simpler. When the German Empire was founded in 1871, twenty-six States existed. These States remained independent, as they were before. They only formed themselves into a Federation, and this Federation was the German Empire.

A long list of little States finally disappeared, for the last time, in the Revolution of 1918. The State

of Turingia was formed out of Saxon-Weimar, Saxon-Meiningen, Saxon-Altenburg, Saxon-Coburg-Gotha, Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, Schwarzburg-Sondershausen, Old Reuss, and Young Reuss. Since then there have been only eighteen States in Germany.

Church unification followed as a consequence of this political concentration. True it is that the simple equalization of State and Church administration has been overcome. In the course of the nineteenth century the tendency to the separation of ecclesiastical and State affairs began—at first in idea, and then in organization. Special Church authorities were introduced. The synodical constitution, which originally existed only amongst the Calvinists, was taken over by the Lutherans. The organization, as it existed in the separate territories, consisted of the parishes, the Synod, and the Church authorities, and was known as the "Established Church." So many States, so many Churches. In reality, however, there were more State Churches than States. As long as no differences existed between Church and State administration, political concentration automatically signified the union of parishes and of Church authorities. As, for instance, after the Wars of Freedom from 1813 to 1815, when a part of the Principality of Saxony fell to Prussia, and the Province of Saxony was created out of the former Duchy of Magdeburg and Altmark, the parishes of these ter-

ritories came automatically under the same rule as the Prussian parishes. It was similar in the case of the annexations in South and West Germany.

Later this simple procedure was not so easy. In the course of the nineteenth century, denominational consciousness became stronger and stronger. During this period, when one territory combined with another, the parishes first made a thorough inquiry into whether there was any organization of the same denomination and of the same ecclesiastical traditions in the new political body. Where this was the case, they united with the new political territory. Where it was not the case, they remained independent. When, in 1864-6 the Provinces of Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, Hessen, Hessen-Nassau, and Frankfort-on-the-Main became a part of Prussia, all the parishes of these territories refused to enter the Prussian Church. They remained independent. As a result of these remnants of old political territories, the number of Established Churches was more than the Federated States. The old Empire had twenty-six States and thirty-six different Churches. In 1918-19 the little Churches of Turingia were, with but one exception, united in a common Church of Turingia, parallel to the political organization. Since then there are twenty-eight State-recognized Protestant Churches in Germany; while apart from these there are a number of small free Churches and sects, which, however, total but a small minority.

Even with this simplified organization, the German Protestant Churches were not satisfied. The tendency became stronger and stronger to combine all Protestant Churches of Germany, if not in one German Church, at least in an association with a common purpose which would extend throughout the country. When the German Empire was founded, all of those administrative functions that did not call for centralization were left to the separate States. For instance, cultural affairs, the Church, schools, and Universities, were regarded as the work of the separate States. The Reich had nothing to do with them. Accordingly, the Protestant Church has had no dealings with the Reich, nor with the administration of the Reich as such, but, instead, only with the separate Federated States.

Gradually, however, there arose common interests and responsibilities that extended beyond the frontiers of the separate States or the bounds of the Church. Germany had colonies. The colonies belonged to the Reich. Evangelical Church congregations existed in the colonies. To which of the separate Federated States should they belong? The Germans in foreign countries organized parishes. They had to be provided with pastors and teachers, and had to have these as well as hymn-books and liturgies from the home country. As a rule they joined the Federated State from which the most of their congregation came, or from which the pastor came.

There were Protestant parishes in foreign countries that were affiliated with the Prussian Church. There were others that were under the Church of Hanover or Saxony. But others found that this was not a satisfactory solution. When, after the Revolution, a new National Constitution was adopted, the Reich as such had to surrender certain cultural affairs to common adjustment. Even if the National Government could not lay down details in the sphere of education and the Church, it nevertheless had certain fundamentals to establish, according to which the separate States had to conform. It was then that a common administration of ecclesiastical interests of the nation became a law of necessity. Just as the Church authorities in former years had come together in the so-called Eisenach Conference, so now a *German Protestant Church Federation* was founded, to which all Protestant Churches of Germany, in so far as they were recognized by the State, were affiliated. With this, a most important step was taken in the unification of ecclesiastical life in Germany.

It is in this direction that unification has to be further developed. On the one hand, the number of Churches in Germany will be decreased by consolidation, and the responsibility of the German Protestant Church Federation, which includes all the Churches, will become greater. One has to be very careful in such matters. Ecclesiastical life is closely

connected with local customs, with the peculiarities of the people and the district. The different ecclesiastical traditions must be carefully protected. Nothing could be further from our idea than that the Protestant Churches of Germany should wish to establish an administration on the same pattern! But our common tasks, in view of the problems connected with the State, with Roman Catholicism, and with modern paganism, are becoming greater and greater. Economic conditions, the establishment of new branches of industry, bring people of all Germany together as never before. The desire of each Province and each Church to have its own hymnals, its own form of divine service, and its own ecclesiastical customs have to be recognized. But one has to accommodate oneself to the new situation. Formerly each Prussian Province had its own hymnal. Now we have come to the point where the German Protestant Church Board—the administrative authority of the Church Federation—has edited a hymnbook which has been adopted by various Church Provinces of Prussia. To that book are appended hymns that are especially loved and known in the various Provinces. Some of the non-Prussian Churches have also adopted this hymnal. So unification proceeds.

The first and most important problem of the union of German Protestantism is thus the progressive unification and adaptation of the various German Estab-

lished Churches, so that German Protestantism, as a Church unit, can be effective in the world at large.

II

The unification efforts of the Protestant Churches of Germany, however, have not been confined to internal German affairs. It has already been mentioned that the development of German Protestant parishes abroad placed new tasks before the home Church. In this regard, a completely new beginning and a new perspective came with the Revolution of 1918.

At first, because of the dictates of Versailles, a number of territories were separated from Germany. In so far as the separation of Alsace-Lorraine was concerned, no ecclesiastical problem arose. The Protestant Churches in Alsace-Lorraine were independent and had no organic connection with the Protestant Churches in Germany. Now they came under French rule. They remained what they were. They had a friendly reception from their French Protestant fellow-believers, with whom they could enter into intercourse.

But it was quite the contrary in the territories to the east—Danzig, Memel, Posen, West Prussia, Upper Silesia. Here the Polish frontier was arbitrarily drawn across German Provinces which at the same time constituted Church Provinces. These

ripped-out sections were made into either "Free States" or incorporated into the Polish State. The independent sections, such as Memel and Danzig, had great difficulty in maintaining existence. Independent existence was absolutely impossible for these Protestant parishes. A Church requires institutions for the training of young pastors. A Church requires institutions for home and foreign missions. A Church requires establishments to care for the economic existence of its pastors. How could these miniature States, which included from twenty-five to seventy parishes, create such institutions? For them there remained absolutely no choice—even after their political separation from Germany they had to retain their connections with the Mother Church.

The same was true of the parishes that were annexed to Poland. In all Poland they did not find one parish of their kind. They were not Lutheran and they were not Calvinist. More precisely, they were indeed Lutheran or Calvinist, but they were combined in a United Protestant Church. This combination had given the parishes a distinct religious character. So these United parishes in Poland could find no contacts with other parishes. On the other hand, they could not exist alone. For this they were too weak economically and numerically, and they were too restricted in spiritual possibilities. For them also there remained but one solution: to retain

their connections with the Mother Church. And so to-day the Protestant Church of the Old Prussian Union includes not only parishes in Prussia, but also those in Danzig, the Memel territory, and Poland. For the first time in German history, the principle was established that Church frontiers do not necessarily coincide with national frontiers.

But that is not all. The end of the World War witnessed the destruction of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. From the north, south, and east, great territories were torn out of Austria. A State structure, called "German-Austria," that can neither live nor die, has been left. German-Austria was and is predominantly Roman-Catholic. Only about 250,000 Protestant Church members live in the country, scattered about through hundreds of parishes. These parishes, economically reduced to poverty, feel themselves incapable of leading an independent existence. But they can enter that loose alliance, the German Protestant Church Federation, which includes all Germany, as well as territories beyond the German frontiers. And so the Protestant Church of Austria joined the Protestant Church Federation.

Finally, the German congregations in other countries. When the German Protestant Church Federation was founded, one of the first tasks confronting it was the necessity of drawing in the Protestant congregations in foreign lands. The new provisions for church assistance to Germans abroad are not per-

fected. But even now the greater part of the German congregation in South America, in England, Italy, and in other countries, have, in some form or other, joined the Church Federation.

Some of the small Free Churches, which have no international connection, are gradually joining the Church Federation, as, for example, the Moravians a short time ago.

It is to be expected that the German Protestant Church Federation will more and more spread over the whole world of Protestants who speak the German tongue. *The second unification problem of German Protestantism is, therefore, this: that this unification should be developed and strengthened, that Free Churches and Congregations which now hold back should join it, and that the German Protestant Church Federation should be recognized by the nations of the whole world as an ecclesiastical organization which has the duty of caring for the religious life of Protestant Germans, independent of political viewpoint or of national frontiers.*

III

The German Reformation was of double origin. The strongest impulse came from Wittenberg. Martin Luther left the stamp of his spirit upon the newly established Protestant Church life in Germany. The parishes in East Prussia, Pomerania, Brandenburg,

Silesia, Lower Saxony, Turingia, were, like the parishes in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Russia, originally Lutheran.

Many Calvinist ideas entered German Protestantism through Zwingli and Calvin. These tendencies were strongest in the territories in Southern Germany, then above all on the Lower Rhine, where they received a strong impulse from Holland. Dutch, Swedish, and French business men then introduced Calvinism into the seaports on the Baltic Sea. The fleeing Huguenots brought it to Brandenburg and Prussia. The territory of the old Polish State received Calvinist communities. In short, in about the year 1800 Germany was predominantly Lutheran, but here and there affected by the establishment of Calvinist parishes.

The tension between Lutherans and Calvinists was very great. Brandenburg and Prussia suffered the most from this, because the ruling house had embraced the Calvinist faith, and the passionate antipathy of Lutherans against Calvinists became noticeable in the original Lutheran districts. After the period of rationalism had forced the denominational differences into the background, Frederick William III grasped the opportunity in 1817 to bring about a Union of Lutheran and Calvinist congregations. He undoubtedly thought of this union as a means of forcing denominational differences into the background. But the strengthening of denomina-

tional consciousness after the Napoleonic Wars made such a union impossible in Prussia. In the Cabinet Order of February 28, 1834, it was announced that the Union meant no surrender of faith or order, and that the creeds of the Lutherans and Calvinists would in no way be abolished. Rather, the parishes should follow the same order of divine service and liturgy as before. In the future course of development it became ever clearer that in the Prussian Union, the Lutheran parishes remained Lutheran and the Calvinist remained Calvinist. Both, however, were under the same Church authorities and the same General-Superintendent; they hold their services in the same manner and permit each other to partake of the Holy Communion.

The Union exists in this form until to-day. There are many parishes within this Union which emphasize their Calvinist or their Lutheran character with great determination. The Calvinist congregations, being in a minority, lay peculiar weight on their denominational characteristics, out of a fear that the predominance of Lutheranism might tend to destroy their traditions. But during a century of intercourse the Lutheran and Calvinist types have mutually fructified. Above all, Calvinism created the Synodical system which to-day governs the entire Prussian Church as well as other German Churches. The Calvinist spirit also lives in the strong emphasis on the individual parishes and their tasks. On the other

hand, Lutheranism has enriched the services with its liturgies. It introduced into Calvinist thought a new element of Church authority, especially the pastoral leadership of the diocese through the General-Superintendent. Thus, in the "Evangelische Kirche der altpreufsischen Union"—it carries this name since the new Church Constitution—a separate type of Church unity has developed.

Similarly in Baden, although different in so far as details are concerned, there grew up a United Established Church. On August 13, 1821, the Calvinist and Lutheran parishes united—in that the creeds of Lutheranism and Calvinism are jointly recognized and an agreement arrived at about the doctrine of the Holy Communion. In Hessen also a Union developed, even if only a beginning.

Thus to-day German Protestantism falls into Lutheran, Calvinist, and United Church domains. *It is very doubtful if the work of unity will proceed along this line of union of the various creeds.* Denominational consciousness is stronger than formerly. The Lutheran parishes of Hanover, Schleswig-Holstein, and Hessen, which, as already mentioned, did not join the Union when they were annexed to Prussia in 1864-6, continued as Lutheran bodies. At present the denominational consciousness is strengthened, in that the Calvinists and Lutherans have tried to come into contact with their fellow-believers in other States. There is a Calvinist League in Germany.

There is an organization of Lutheranism. The Calvinists, as well as the Lutherans, take an active part in the international conferences of their special denominations.

IV

After the World War the waves of the great œcumenical work of unity beat upon the shores of Germany. The Protestant Churches in Germany were at first very reserved in their attitude toward the World Conference on Faith and Order. The problems which so moved England and America were unknown to Germany. The mixing of the Churches and the competitive struggle of the denominations is restricted to a minimum in Germany. Small localities with a number of Churches are very rare. In general, the old territorial frontiers of the denominations remain rigidly fixed. Only occasionally does one see, near the church towers of the Church which is recognized by the State, the chapels of this or that small Free Church. The old Established Church dominates the field throughout. And one often almost wishes that the differences were greater and the competition of the denominations more lively.

It is only out in the mission field that the problem of division has any significance for Protestant Christianity in Germany. On the whole, the German missionaries stand on a very good footing with the Presbyterian and other Protestant missions of other coun-

tries. Occasionally they had difficulties with the missions of the Church of England, and with the Baptists, the Missourians, and some small Church bodies, but with the modest scope that the German mission work has, these difficulties do not carry any very great weight.

The Conference on Life and Work found all the greater echo in Germany. The coöperation of different and independent Churches was the direction in which religious life in Germany always pointed. During the World War and the years following, German Christians learned that the peoples of the world were bound together in a common destiny. Because of its geographical situation, Germany, more than any of the Great Powers, came into more direct contact with the Communist propaganda of Soviet Russia. In Germany we learned first that a great fight between Christianity and the modern Cæsar cult of Bolshevism was being prepared. Here it is to be understood that this fight can take place only if Christendom collects its forces behind a united front. But above all, Germany, which had passed through a revolution, came to feel most deeply that the traditional moral standards were breaking down, that the claim of individual licence was penetrating every sphere of culture, and threatening the spiritual and moral life of the people with chaos. Only a united advance of all Christian Churches can bring a reali-

zation of absolute standards of Christian morality to a confused world.

The World Conference in Stockholm rested upon this knowledge. The Churches of Germany took part in this conference with the deepest earnestness. Since then they have devoted themselves to the continuation of this work. They have taken a prominent part in the new Social-Ethical Institute at Geneva. They will also continue to work along these lines in the future.

Participation in the World Conference of Lausanne was much more difficult for Germany. No German Church is in a position to allow its doctrinal traditions to be touched. Also, in respect to its ministerial Orders, German Protestanism stands by its reformation traditions. Practically all of the Protestant Churches of Germany have the episcopal order. The Lutheran Churches have decided to again introduce the official title of Bishop, or "Landesbischof." The Protestant Church of the Old Prussian Union, by far the greatest of all German Churches, has, for the time being, refused this official title, and has maintained the title of General-Superintendent. It is all the same—it is a matter that is concerned with the highest clerical office which carries with it the power of ordaining and the duties of spiritual leadership of the parishes and the clergy. But this order does not require any further ordination or special consecration.

No Protestant Church of Germany would consider the remodeling of its episcopal Order on the pattern of the Roman Catholics or the Anglicans even as worth discussing. The practical necessity for this does not exist.

Despite this, the German Churches went to Lausanne—even if not as official representatives. They showed their willingness to assist in a clarification of theological and ecclesiastical differences, to learn to know and understand each other better, and in this way to create a basis for common work where there had been no coöperation before. This willingness will continue to exist in the German Churches, and especially in German theological science, in the future.

So the problem of unification is of a very different kind in Germany than that in most other great countries of the world. *And still it is just in Germany that the great need for the uniting of the forces of Christianity is more deeply felt than anywhere else.* Germany feels this all the more deeply in its present period of transition, a period of colossal spiritual crisis. That Christendom may be united at this time in order to show to a world inimical to Christianity what the strength of the living Lord has to offer humanity—that is a wish and a prayer that flows from hundreds of thousands of hearts in Germany. And what the German Protestant Church can do to fulfil this prayer it will most certainly do.

THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN

THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN

By The Most Rev. Nathan Söderblom,
D.D., Ph.D., D.C.L., M.D.
Archbishop of Upsala, Pro-Chancellor of the University

I am asked to write on the Reunion of Christendom from the point of view of the Church of Sweden.

I

Sweden has been called by Madison Grant in the New World and by several authors in the Old World the most united nation on earth in blood, language, history, traditions, religious, and political institutions.

This is due to a certain extent to the fact that the Church in our country never became fully Romanized during the Middle Ages, because of its remote situation in Christendom. What has been called in England Anglicanism and in France Gallicanism has existed in Sweden to a certain extent throughout the whole history of the Church in Sweden.

The same remote situation can explain why the great Western heresies never found any real following in our country.

For such reasons it was natural that the renewal of the Gospel and of the Church operated by Martin Luther in the sixteenth century and propagated in

Sweden by such devoted and great Christian thinkers and characters as Olaus Petri, Laurentius (Lars) Petri, and their older friend Laurentius Andrae, embraced the whole nation. No blood was shed. No Romanism was left on the whole. The so-called reformation was in our country fully aware of its continuity with the Church of all ages, although it naturally took its inspiration from the Gospel and from the first centuries of the Church. The reform was more conservative than in any other country. Episcopacy was retained with election and with unbroken succession from Rome, and it became constitutional. The King, Gustaf Wasa, was reckless in using Church property for the welfare of the realm and its national freedom; but we have, as the late learned Bishop of Salisbury, John Wordsworth, has remarked in his beautiful history of *The National Church in Sweden*, an authentic testimony of how the renewal had gripped what was living and strong and active in the nation. In 1593 the King was Roman Catholic, Sigismund Wasa, one of the most beloved monarchs of Polonia. The regent, his uncle, Carl IX, had sympathies for the mitigated Calvinism of Heidelberg. In this awkward situation a free Christian Council gathered in Upsala, convoked by the theologians of Upsala under the leadership of the young professor Nils Bothniensis, consisting of Councilors and of the Bishops of the kingdom, of the nobility, the clergy and tradesmen. The resolution

passed by Upsala Möte was then undersigned by lots of people, priests, yeomen, merchants and others in the country. That resolution declares Sweden to "keep with one accord to God's pure and saving Word put down in the writings of the holy prophets, evangelists and apostles"; adding then to the three Old Œcumenical Creeds the chief Evangelic Lutheran Creed, the *Confessio augustana* of 1530, which had been styled with a possible reconciliation with a reformed papacy in view. That meeting gave also, after those Creeds, to the Handbook (*Church Law and Liturgy*) of Archbishop Lars of 1571 a kind of symbolic authority, thereby retaining episcopacy and a sacramental view of worship, vestments, etc., but repudiating papacy. Archbishop Lars writes in the Preface: "The Papists will probably accuse this Handbook for not being Catholic, because it often differs from the Roman Church. On the contrary the others who think that they are the right and true Evangelicals . . . will certainly call it Papistic, because it retains some Ceremonies which have been and are still used by the Papists." "We have no scruples about calling the Lord's Supper Mass. . . . Nor is it forbidden to call this Sacrament sacrifice." About salt and exorcism in the Baptism, elevation (with the ringing of the small bell) in the Mass and other ceremonies kept in the Handbook 1571, the Church Council, 1593, says that they must be duly explained. If, in spite of such teaching, abuse and

wrong interpretations cannot be abolished, such ceremonies might be changed, but only after careful consideration, calmly and without offense.

At the same time it must be kept in mind that the Church in Sweden has never called itself officially in any document of any time Lutheran or Evangelic Lutheran. It is simply "The Church of Sweden," "The Swedish Church," or rather the Church in Sweden. Its relation to the realm has never been more clearly experienced, thought out, and defined than by the grandson of Gustaf Wasa and the son of Carl IX, Gustaf II Adolf (died 1632). He spoke and wrote many times about "the majesty (that is, the sovereign freedom and self-government) of the Swedish realm, and the Church of God, which dwells therein." The Church of God is in many countries and realms. It forms also the very soul of the Swedish nation, and has as such a definite content and character.

Sweden became most exclusively and intolerantly Evangelic Lutheran. It would take too long here to tell how in Sweden as in other countries in modern times other forms of Christianity were first only tolerated for diplomatic reasons then, but by and by acknowledged. I will try to sum up the actual situation.

(*a*) We have a very few Greek Orthodox, especially from Russia. Our relations with them are excellent, already for the very reason that they are so few. Gustaf Adolf organized a theological conversa-

tion in Esthonia, belonging then to the Swedish realm, in Reval, between Swedish theologians and Orthodox Russian theologians in order to prove that the Moscovites are, as he wrote, Christians, not as many in the West think, not Christians. That Commission stated very carefully what was common between the Swedish and the Orthodox theologians and what separated them.

(*b*) The Roman Catholics in our country have become a little more numerous in the last years, and count to-day at least 3,500 members in a population of a little more than 6,000,000. The Roman Catholic congregations were formed from the beginning for foreigners, but also a number of Swedes are Roman Catholics. To-day more active propaganda has been made in Sweden as everywhere by Roman agencies. That propaganda has perhaps aroused some discussion. The Swedish national character is most strongly opposed to the absolutism and the methods of Romanism. I myself have been accused sometimes of sharing tendencies that priests or laymen in Sweden find infected, influenced by some Roman Catholic flavor. The idea of self-government and of individual judgment and personal freedom and respect for the law is deeply rooted in the Swedish character, where the yeomen (farmers) have never been slaves or serfs, but always self-governing citizens. It is not thinkable that the Swedish nation as such can accept the absolutism of modern Roman Catholicism. But

recent Church history has proved that we are not few in Sweden who think that the strivings for unity must include or try to include all Christians and all sections of Christ's Church.

(*c*) An American Methodist Episcopal Bishop said rightly in Sweden a few years ago that Methodism in Sweden must be considered as an effect of re-emigration from the United States, and as a result of our close relationship to North American religion and Church life. The Methodist Episcopal Church forms an independent body of her own with about 20,000 adherents. The Church historian knows that John Wesley acquired his full theory of justification by faith indirectly or directly from Luther by reading or hearing Luther's writings. We have the same doctrine of salvation. But Methodism has a system of parish training and Church life of its own.

(*d*) The Baptist Communion was introduced in Sweden in the forties and fifties of last century. The Baptists, I am sorry to say, as other sons and daughters of Biblical revivals, were treated rather badly even unto the second half of last century, not only by representatives of the State, but also by several servants of the Church. They formed congregations of their own and separated from the Church. Now to-day, no single Baptist in Sweden is separated from the Church. They have their groups and preachers and chapels inside the Church of Sweden. They be-

long to the Parish Assemblies; they are sometimes elected to the Parish Councils, which have existed in our country practically from the very beginning as a continuation of the self-government in the heathen times. The Baptists count more than 60,000 adherents. Most of them belong to the same organization. Some Free Baptists form groups from time to time. To-day the so-called Pentecost movement has been a real revival with glossolalia (= speaking with tongues) that has divided the Baptists and augmented the number of those who are baptized as adults. The relation of the Church to the chief Baptist community in Sweden is now satisfactory.

(*e*) The same must with still more reason be said about the relation of Svenska Missionsförbundet, our largest free religious organization, to the Church.

The religious revival in the fifties and sixties of last century was divided in two groups because of the opposition of Rev. P. P. Waldenström to the doctrine of redemption. That difference disappeared later, but his followers are still opposed to the idea of a national Church, and pretend to follow the New Testament's scheme in regarding their communities not as equal to the parish but as special groups of believers, who form a society. That congregational doctrine does not prevent them from staying in the Church. They have chapels of their own. But they sometimes belong even to the Parish Councils; they

vote at the election of parsons, take active part in the Parish Assemblies, and not seldom come to the worship in the Church.

The relation of those more or less diverging groups to the Church has become more and more marked by courtesy. A certain coöperation has been effected in the mission field. The Swedish Committee of the World Alliance has representatives from all Evangelic groups in the country beside the Church, and acts at the same time as a Swedish Committee on Life and Work. The World Conference on Life and Work in Stockholm, 1925, shows, as the Metropolitan of Stockholm, Dr. Widner, wrote, its most obvious effect in our country in a more hearty fellowship between the Church and other religious bodies.

Preachers of Missionförbundet and of the Methodist Church and of the Baptist Society not seldom appeal for an ordination to the ministry in the Church. The great hindrance is that the Church makes university studies and theological degree at the University a condition for priesthood. When once Missionsförbundet will send its future ministers to the University for theological studies, it seems likely that full reunion will be operated. The ministers of the other religious bodies are not recognized by the Church as having due authority for the distribution of the sacraments, etc. This is, of course, due to the lack of ordination in the Church. The chief point is the lack of university studies.

The splendid work of the free religious bodies especially in the mission field and the whole-hearted devotion of many of their members are fully recognized by the Church, which has certainly entered more deeply into the popular mind through the revival in the middle of the last century and which has also been healthily influenced by the free religious movement. At the same time one cannot but regret overlapping, rivalry and weakening of Christian work, caused by the disunion inside the Church. Division of labor, coöperation and full organized reunion are most desirable.

II

The Church in our country belongs to the Evangelic Lutheran Confession.

The international Lutheranism is represented by the Allgemeine Evangelische Lutherische Konferenz, and in a more complete way by the Lutheran World Convention, which was founded after the war in Eisenach, 1923, and which will have its next session in Copenhagen, 1929. The Evangelic Lutheran Communion counts about at least 70,000,000 baptized in the New and in the Old Worlds. It has three chief branches.

(1) The prophet of Church renewal in the sixteenth century, Martin Luther, was put outside of the Roman Communion against his will, and was bound to found in a rather clumsy way a new Church organ-

ization, first in Germany. Evangelic Lutheran Communions are also to be found on the Continent in Holland, France, Austria, Hungary, Jugo-Slavia, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Russia. Smaller communions of Lutherans are found in other continental States. The largest Churches outside Germany on the Continent are Poland, with at least 1,300,000 (the Lutherans in the Uniate Church of Posen included), and in Hungary, which counted 1,250,000 Lutherans before the Peace of Versailles.

(2) No nations have been so entirely penetrated by the Evangelic Lutheran conception of religion and its ideals as the peoples of the North, where, as in Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Esthonia, the nation adopted the evangelic renewal in the sixteenth century as such, and in Latvia, where the great majority of the people belongs to that faith. The Church in those countries has Bishops, who are in Sweden constitutional, that is, the Chapter or Consistory forms the government of the diocese with the Bishop as president, who can be outvoted by the Chapter. Since the war and the revolution Episcopacy has been gradually (by degrees) reintroduced into Evangelic Lutheran Communion in Germany.

(3) The third chief center of Evangelic Lutheran faith is the United States, where the last statistics indicate a population of more than 15,000,000 baptized Lutherans with families. As to active membership, the Evangelic Lutheran Church in the United

States comes in the third place amongst the non-Roman bodies after Baptists and Methodists, having about the same size as the Presbyterian Communion, but being divided as yet into several languages and sections (so-called synods).

III

If we go outside the Evangelic Lutheran Communion, the Church of Sweden is the only national Church which has intercommunion with the Church of England. An initiative was taken by the Lambeth Conference of 1888. In 1908 the Lord Bishop of Kalmar was delegated to the Lambeth Conference. In 1909 in September an episcopal commission, under the presidency of Bishop Ryle, then of Winchester, and with Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury, Canon Mason of Canterbury, Canon Bernard of Salisbury as other English members, was sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to Upsala, where a closer alliance between those two national sections of the Church was discussed during three days. A joint commission of Swedish and English Churchmen was founded. The decisive resolutions were passed by the Lambeth Conference of 1920 and by the Swedish Bishops Council in April 1922. The Lambeth Conference decided:

"The Conference welcomes the Report of the Commission appointed after the last Conference, entitled

'The Church of England and the Church of Sweden,' and, accepting the conclusions there maintained on the succession of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden and the conception of the priesthood set forth in its standards, recommends that members of that Church qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church should be admitted to Holy Communion in ours. It also recommends that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches.

"If the authorities of any province of the Anglican Communion find local irregularities in the order or practice of the Church of Sweden outside that country, they may legitimately, within their own region, postpone any such action as is recommended in this resolution until they are satisfied that these irregularities have been removed."

We quote from the answer of the Swedish Bishops' Council:

"We are convinced that between our branches of the Universal Church of Christ, notwithstanding the shades of opinion that may exist, there is an essential unity in that fundamental conception which we have now briefly indicated, and to which we unswervingly adhere. In this conviction we accept with fraternal confidence the outstretched hand. We rejoice at the decision of the Anglican Bishops, and on our side we

approve of the practice that members of the Anglican Communion, qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in our Church, as well as that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Anglican ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches and there to perform religious functions."

"May God give His blessing to the more intimate connection between our Churches that we are now establishing, and may the Church of Christ in our countries from this connection reap rich fruits for her spiritual life.

"May we thus also be made better fitted to become instruments in the hand of God for the establishing of the bond of unity and peace between the disciples of Christ all over the earth!"

That carefully prepared fellowship, even at the Lord's table, between two national Churches means a real step towards Reunion of Christendom. The same careful method must be heartily recommended for closer fellowship between other national Churches.

As Evangelic Lutherans we have the pulpit in common with our Evangelic or Protestant brethren of the One Catholic Church, and it is hoped that the pure doctrine of salvation is preached from those pulpits according to the divine revelation in the Gospel and to the experience of unnumbered souls. But our

Churches have not one single center, the pulpit. They may rather be compared with an ellipse, which has two foci. We have also an altar, which means the mystery of the Sacrament and the mystery of adoration. That altar unites us *mutatis mutandis* with the Orthodox and Roman sections of the Catholic Church of God. Both altar and pulpit have the same importance in another section of the Church, I mean in the Anglican and Episcopal Communion.

IV

Thus I have also indicated our fellowship with the other sections of Evangelic Christendom. Those who derive more or less directly from the genius of Calvin, who organized dogmatic thought and the fellowship of believers, are all more or less closely akin in doctrine and ethical ideas. In international gatherings the intimate spiritual relation between Lutherans and Presbyterians has been witnessed.

The characteristic Evangelic Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith was most authentically adopted in the Anglo-Saxon world by Methodism. Everybody knows John Wesley's account of his experience during the voyage to America on board the ship. Back in London he found "the old road by faith alone," when somebody read aloud Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans.

Also other Protestant bodies such as Baptists be-

long to the same large section of Evangelic Christendom. I write "Evangelic" like some later English authors, because "Evangelical" seems to suggest a special type of piety, whereas Evangelic is an analogy to Catholic. The great dogmaticians and scholastics of the Evangelic Lutheran faith called themselves *Evangelic Catholic* ("Confessio Evangelica Catholica").

V

From the beginning we had no direct relation to the Orthodox section of the Church, because the separation between East and West and the mutual anathemas from Rome and Constantinople had taken place before Sweden was christianized. Our old steady intercourse with Russia, which got its name from the Swedish Väringar or Vikings from the province Roslagen (the country of the *Ros, Rus*), still to-day a part of the archdiocese of Upsala, necessitated a clear view of the relationship between Evangelic and Orthodox faith. Numerous Orthodox believers belonged to the Swedish realm from the latter part of the sixteenth century to the beginning of the eighteenth century. Gustaf Adolf realized the necessity of providing generously for the free exercise of their own faith and worship. A forerunner to Bishop Brent and to the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, he arranged, as we have mentioned,

a Theological Colloquium at Reval in Esthonia between Swedish and Orthodox theologians.

In order to deliver the Orthodox Christians in the Swedish realm from the political influence of Russia, Gustaf Adolf sent an embassy to Constantinople in order to obtain bishops consecrated and recognized by the highest spiritual authority of the Orthodox Church. The best portrait of the great Patriarch Cyrillus Lucaris is to be found in Sweden in Strömsberg, a memory of the friendship established at that epoch in our northern realm between two of the three great historic sections of the Church. The same story has been repeated in our days, when the small Orthodox minorities that now enjoy freedom in the new national States of Finland, Esthonia, and Latvia have addressed themselves to the Œcumenical Throne in Constantinople in order to become autocephal.

It was that Œcumenical Patriarchate which in 1920 advocated a "League of Churches" for mutual coöperation in regard to the social and moral principles of Christendom. At the great Conference of Lausanne Archbishop Germanos, the spokesman of the whole Eastern Orthodox delegation, quoted and accentuated that proposal which was partly achieved by the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work, created also by other initiatives. The Orthodox delegation at Lausanne concluded with regard to doctrine, that "the bases assumed for the foundation of the Reports which are to be submitted to the vote of

the Conference are inconsistent with the principles of the Orthodox Church which we represent." Our Orthodox brethren proposed a partial Reunion of the other Churches represented at Lausanne as a precedent to general Reunion. They said: "In consequence, while we, the undersigned Orthodox representatives, must refrain from agreeing to any Reports other than that upon the Message of the Church, which we accept and are ready to vote upon, we desire to declare that, in our judgment, the most which we can now do is to enter into coöperation with other Churches in the social and moral sphere on a basis of Christian love." And they gave a beautiful testimony of their full communion with their fellow-Christians in Lausanne, if not in the *fides quæ creditur,* certainly in the *fides qua creditur,* in the trust in God through Christ. They said: "We are one with our brethren here in faith in our lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." According to that declaration the already existing unity in Life and Work must prepare a full unity in Faith and Order.

VI

The relation to the Roman Communion implies a more complicated problem. The chief peculiar symbol or confession of the Evangelic Lutheran Communion which fully endorses the three old creeds or symbols, the *Confessio Augustana,* was written in

view of Reunion with Rome, and some of the noblest representatives of the Roman hierarchy, even in the Collegium of Cardinals, sincerely hoped for a reunion on that ground. But things went otherwise. In the *Tridentinum* the Roman Communion accentuated its confessional and doctrinal exclusiveness on lines partly indicated by the new modern form of piety, created by the great Spanish knight Ignatius of Loyola. That exclusiveness has been more and more accentuated and enriched by new doctrines and practices not acceptable to the Evangelic and Orthodox sections of the One Catholic Church. It may be said in general that we in our Evangelic Lutheran faith lay more stress on doctrine than on the institution, whereas to our Roman brethren the "holy hierarchical Church" or the papal Church lays more stress on institution than on doctrine. Or rather, according to the Roman view, institutions belong to doctrine in another way than with us. But our Evangelic Lutheran faith has two very distinct features analogous with Rome; so far no other section of Western Christendom exhibits the same relative kinship and likeness with the Roman section as the Evangelic Lutheran Church.

(1) Transubstantiation was repudiated by Martin Luther, but he adopted the doctrine of consubstantiation in the Sacrament, and he had a harsh criticism both of those who found it necessary to summon the Divinity to enter the elements of the Sacrament, and

of those who found it necessary to uplift the soul during the Lord's Supper to the heavenly abode of Christ. He said that God and Christ are everywhere. You cannot localize them. But our Lord has ordained that we should meet and enjoy Him in the Sacrament. No Western Church outside Rome has accentuated the mystery of the Sacrament as strongly and consistently as the Evangelic Lutheran faith.

(2) The second feature is the explicit way in which the doctrine is expounded in the normative symbolic documents. The *Concordia Pia* of 1580, with its large content, forms, as far as I understand, the closest analogy in existence to the *Tridentinum*. Their views on religion are different. And the Book of Concord has the original note of a creative genius. It constitutes a remarkable composition of cautious will to unity, prophetic and evangelic mind and powerful theological thinking.

In spite of the condemnation of the Œcumenical strivings for Christian Fellowship and Reunion, formulated by the Vatican in the Encyclical *Mortalium Animos,* the endeavors for Reunion are shared both in a hearty and in a scholarly way by many eminent Roman priests and theologians. And some of the greatest laymen of the Roman Church to-day regret that Papacy has not as yet found its way to take a part in conferences for Reunion. Inside the Roman Communion there is a greater number of souls than one thinks which are more Catholic than Ultramon-

tane and Roman—a prophecy of an epoch when Roman and Catholic will not any more mean alternatives and contrasts, but when the Roman hierarchy will recognize its fellowship with the other sections of the Una Sancta Catholica et Apostolica Ecclesia. For my part, I think that such a mutual understanding will be accomplished first in Germany, where a blessed action is already at work.

VII

The Church is already One, as we confess in the third article of our Creed. She consists of the souls in heaven and on earth, who have a life in God and His Christ. Her unity is visible already now in deeds of love and truth and justice, in prayer, in the Word, and Sacraments.

But the divisions of the Church are in disharmony with its essential unity. How can the Church be really one visible body? If we start from above, that unity must be realized through the revealed truth, its outcome in creed and life, ministry, and the due exercise of the Charismas of the Holy Spirit.

If we start from below, the souls who confess Christ with life and tongue in the same country must constitute more and more conscious groups, communities, and parishes, consecrated by the Baptism, by Confirmation, and Holy Communion, and forming together the living organism of a national Church.

Where different communions or denominations are found in the one and the same nation, they might be blended into one, or a unity in multiplicity may be realized in mutual full recognition and fellowship in the Holy Communion; or the very character of some such groups or denominations indicates their task as free societies inside the national Church, loyal to it, and coöperating organically for the same sacred end. God be praised, because unity in organization and creed, the full fellowship in life and work, in worship and the Lord's Supper, already exists in supernational communions and denominations. The geography of the Church to-day has more striking and essential denominational frontiers crossing the borders of nations and languages than the frontiers of the national Churches. That great fact must facilitate the organic union of the national Churches and of the denominations into one visible organization, Christ's body on earth. The unity in multiplicity must be maintained in that reunited universal Catholic, Evangelic, and Orthodox Church not only as an historic necessity, because of difference in traditions, experiences, and sacred customs, but also as a divine boon and institution, exhibiting the richness and diversity of the spiritual Charismas, and thus making the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church more akin with its divine origin and more fit for its divine scope.

REUNION FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

REUNION FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By The Rt. Rev. F. T. Woods, D.D.
Lord Bishop of Winchester

There is no more glaring instance of the innate conservatism of the average man, especially where his religion is concerned, than the apathy which still prevails in large tracts of Christendom in regard to Reunion. It is not that the great enterprise is neglected. In almost every Church, apart from the Roman Catholic Church, the leaders are well started along the road, but the rank and file are slow to follow, and until a divine *afflatus* comes upon them and spurs them anew to praying and thinking and action it is difficult to foresee any appreciable prospect of advance in the immediate future. Even a modicum of imagination, one would have thought, would supply a powerful incentive.

Imagine the Churches of the world able to speak with one voice on such subjects as International Peace, International Purity,[1] on the treatment of child-races, or the perils of materialism. Imagine a united Church able to call men everywhere to a new

[1] Cf. the investigations of the League of Nations on the white slave traffic.

sense of God and a new submission to His will. Or to come nearer home, imagine the Christians of London united in one organism, holding a common faith, free to worship in each other's churches, united in the fundamentals, but allowing, and gladly allowing, very wide divergencies in secondary matters, but presenting an unbroken front to the paganism of our day. Or imagine a village where, instead of the people gathering week by week in two or three rival churches, the whole community could worship together, not necessarily in the same building every time or in the same way, but knowing that, whatever divergencies there might be, they were one Body, that the whole spiritual life of the village was gathered into one focus, and that in all concerning the moral welfare of the community they could consult together, pray together, and, if need be, act together.

Fond dreams, I shall be told. But this was for all intents and purposes the actual experience of the Church for a thousand years and more, and this was and is the deliberately expressed intention of the Divine Founder. The great majority of people, however, even members of that adventurous society the Church of Christ, prefer the line of least resistance which is always inaction, love to "let sleeping dogs lie," and "look" so long "before they leap" that even the thought of any such movement is paralyzed.

None the less, the Church of England—for that is my main concern in this article—has never, since the

break-up of the medieval Church, been content with the disunion which resulted.

Conversations between the Anglican and Roman Churches took place not once nor twice long after the breach in the sixteenth century. In 1634, for instance, Sir Francis Windebank, one of the Secretaries of State, is reported to have said to a Papal messenger: "If we had neither Jesuits nor Puritans, I am confident a union might easily be effected," and to have further informed the Italian that "all the moderate men in Church and State thirsted after a union." The year before an English Franciscan had anticipated Tract 90 by the statement that the XXXIX Articles were "patient, but not ambitious" of a Catholic interpretation; and the same writer declared himself in favor of the validity of Anglican ordinations.[1] At this time, however, there was nothing definite in the way of negotiation. In the reign of Charles II there was a good deal of discussion in regard to the possibility of such a reunion. At that time there was an enlightened Pope who, though he was not willing to sanction the views of Santa Clara (the Franciscan above mentioned) as to Anglican Orders, yet was willing to go a long way towards making peace.

"He was prepared to sanction the re-consecration of all the existing Bishops, and to give the King the

[1] K. D. Mackenzie, *The Confusion of the Churches*, p. 109.

right of nominating in future. The Archbishop of Canterbury was to enjoy a patriarchal position: the national peculiarities of the English Church were to be recognized; the spoils of the Reformation were not to be disgorged: Communion in both kinds was to be allowed, if desired: Mass must be said in Latin, but the addition of English hymns was permissible: married clergy were not to be required to put away their wives, though in future celibacy must be observed: there was to be no persecution of Protestants." [1]

Still more definite later on were the negotiations of Archbishop Wake with the Gallican Church, and indirectly therefore with the Papacy. Even at the beginning of the eighteenth century it was asserted "that the true difference between the High and Low Church parties was that the former 'were for finding means of reconciliation with Rome and bringing the Pope to terms; while the other party were for accommodating matters and forming a union between the English Church and foreign Protestant Churchmen.'" [2] It is true that there was no ardent love for the Pope among the ecclesiastics of the Gallican Church, but they were of course unhesitatingly Roman Catholic, and if the great Bossuet could have secured the acceptance of his four famous proposi-

[1] K. D. Mackenzie, *The Confusion of the Churches*, p. 127.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 135, 136.

tions, the history of the Anglican Church might have taken a very different course. The propositions, it will be remembered, were as follows:

I. In secular matters the Pope and the hierarchy have no authority.
II. The Papal power is subject to a General Council.
III. This power is also limited by the canons of the Church, and Gallican usages should not be condemned.
IV. Papal decrees are *only* irreformable *by consent of the Church.*[1]

Few Archbishops indeed before the present time have been so eager and energetic in the great cause of Reunion, for not only was Wake in touch in this way with both Catholic France and Rome, but he was also holding out his hand to the Calvinists of France and Switzerland and to the Moravians of Bohemia.[2] It is interesting and pathetic too to speculate as to what might have taken place if England had not been terrified and her mind warped by the remembrance of the Marian persecution, and if Rome on her side had been willing to accept Bossuet's principles and to go just a little further in accommodation to the Anglican outlook. In fact, one of the sobering and saddening reflections in the whole controversy, as in

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 136, 137.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

other reaches of history, is the degree in which the trend of centuries was affected for good or ill by the temper and action of individuals. If Mary had been tactful and reasonable instead of narrow and relentless, what might have happened in England? If Charles I had been sensible and conciliatory, what might have happened in Scotland? If the Nonjurors had remained within the Church and had leavened it with that temper in which, when the Wesleyan revival began, it was conspicuously lacking, what might have been the result?

No words can exaggerate the urgency of this great adventure, but if any further emphasis were needed to bring it home to members of the Anglican Communion, it would be found in the imminence of another Lambeth Conference. In 1930 the Bishops from every branch of our Communion will forgather in the famous library of Lambeth Palace, and it is certain that the subject of Reunion will be supreme among the items which must figure on the agenda for discussion and decision. Ten years ago the Conference produced the now famous Lambeth Appeal. The results of that Appeal will have to be reviewed together with all that has happened since, and the next steps determined. I will attempt a rough estimate of the situation at the present moment.

First, as to the results of the Appeal. Five years ago the Archbishop of Canterbury, writing to the

Metropolitans of our Communion, summarized the results up to that date in words some of which I will venture to quote. Speaking of the conversations with certain leaders of the Free Churches here in England, he says:

"I would remind you that here in England, within a few weeks of our transmitting the Appeal to the authorities of the different Free Churches, a series of conferences began to be held at Lambeth between leaders officially appointed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches and a number of English Bishops. I think I am not exaggerating when I say that these conferences in their composition, their character, and their purpose have no precedent in the history of the Church in these islands. The Archbishop of York has throughout taken the lead in the discussions, and I cannot sufficiently express the debt owed by the whole Church to the wisdom, determination, and patience with which he has guided the spokesmen on the different sides and assisted them in their efforts to reach agreement in the truth." [1]

Referring to the visits, some undertaken by himself, some by the Archbishop of York, to commend the Appeal to the Annual Assemblies of several of the chief Churches in England and Scotland, he continues:

[1] G. K. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 339.

"It seems to me therefore that we have a right, with thankfulness to Almighty God, to regard the position in Great Britain itself, as fraught with abundant hope. There can be no question that the leaders upon all sides, and through them the officers, clerical and lay, of the respective Churches, are disposed in quite a novel degree to appreciate one another's position and to look forward to a yet nearer approach." [1]

He goes on to speak of "encouraging news" from South India, from America, from Australia, from Sweden, from the Eastern Orthodox Church. He speaks of the Malines Conversations, and he sums up in remarkable words:

"It seems to me quite clear that in almost every part of the world where the Anglican Communion is found—in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, East Africa, West Africa, and also in Japan, in China, in Egypt, in Palestine, and in many parts of the Continent of Europe—a new spirit of fellowship, a new readiness for understanding and coöperation have been revealed during these eventful years." [2]

Since then there has been considerable progress. The South India scheme for Reunion is a case in

[1] G. K. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 340.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 341.

point. This is itself the result of the heart-breaking wastage of men and money due to overlapping, and even competing Churches, which is only too common in the mission field as it is at home. "Four places of worship," says the Indian Bishop [1] more immediately concerned, "stand within a hundred yards of each other in one of the cities of India, each barely half full at any ordinary Sunday service, all ministered to by underpaid ministers, each too often engaged in unceasing warfare, not against the sin and suffering all round, but each against the supposed defects in the beliefs and practices of the others. Seven missionary societies," he goes on, "are at work in my area among a population of a million people, five of which claim the exclusive possession of the Gospel truth and, therefore, the right to enter and plant churches anywhere. Such a multiplication of churches in the same area renders Church discipline exceedingly difficult and ineffective. By our divisions we not only waste our resources, but also diminish the Church's effectiveness for righteousness and purity in non-Christian lands. Unity, organic unity, is the only remedy." [2]

Little wonder that he and others have felt constrained to do whatever is Christianly possible to end such a scandal. Accordingly a scheme of reunion has

[1] Bishop Azariah of Dornakal.

[2] *Faith and Order:* Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927, p. 492.

been carefully thought out, and is, it is hoped, on the way to consummation. Presbyterians and Congregationalists have already come together in the South Indian United Church. A joint committee of this Church, the Wesleyan Methodists, and the Anglican Church have constructed a plan which may lead to this larger reunion. The plan has been approved by the Episcopal Synod and by the General Council of the Church in India, Burma, and Ceylon. The plan includes a provision with a view to bridging over the period till an episcopally ordained ministry is established throughout the Church by which it is agreed that "all who at the time of union are ministers of the Uniting Churches, should be accorded after union the position of ministers of the Word and Sacraments in the United Church." [1] The Bishop of Dornakal, whose words have already been quoted, speaks for the entire mission field in the searching and stirring words that he used at the great Conference at Lausanne:

"We must have one Church. We want a Church of India, a Church which can be our spiritual home, a Church where the Indian religious genius can find natural expression, a living branch of the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, a Church which, being a visible symbol of unity in that divided land, will draw all men to our Blessed Lord." [1]

[1] *The Call to West and East*, p. 134.

These words may well be supplemented by what was said by Bishop Brent in his opening sermon at the Conference, and which may serve to drive home (if need be) the desperate drawback of disunion to the Church's witness in the world at large:

"Through unity alone can the world believe and know that the Father has sent Jesus Christ to reveal Him to the whole human race. It stands as the unalterable condition on which He can fulfil His mission to mankind. . . .

"What a challenge to Christendom to set its own house in order before it further infects the Eastern world with sectarianism that robs the Gospel of its corporate power and gives people a stone instead of bread! The hundred missionary societies in China to-day are as suicidal for Christianity as the civil divisions are to her national peace and prosperity. The Christian Orient to-day is in just revolt not against Christianity but against divided Christianity, not against foreigners either in politics or religion but against the domination of foreigners."

Those sentences, solemn and thrilling as they are, justly express what may be called the mind of Lausanne. The astonishing phenomenon at that historic gathering—though it should not be astonishing to the believer in prayer—was the large measure of unity which, it transpired, is already existing in regard to

the fundamentals of the Christian faith. This has been my own experience in that sister-enterprise, the Stockholm Conference on "Life and Work," in which to a large extent the same personnel has been involved. At Stockholm, and in subsequent meetings of its Continuation Committee, it was always apparent that, though our approach to Reunion was only indirect—we are concerned with Christian morality rather than Christian doctrine—we could, as a fact, find a basis of unity in the Nicene Creed, though we might not all attach the same importance to a specific form of words and might not all give the same interpretation to every phrase. But such differences are not greater than already obtain within the borders of the Anglican Communion. It is of the happiest possible omen, as well as of the utmost possible importance, that the three main roads to Christian unity should have been explored by these gatherings of Christian leaders each of them in its way and in the literal meaning of the word, "epoch-making": the road by way of faith and order—at once the most difficult and the most direct—explored at Lausanne; the road by way of "applied Christianity" (in the province of social, industrial, and educational reform), explored at Stockholm; and the road by way of the mission field, explored at Jerusalem.

One fact which at Lausanne became even more obvious than before is that in all this modern en-

deavor a peculiar opportunity and responsibility rests upon the Anglican Communion. In a letter to *The Times* on his return from the Conference, Bishop Gore called it a "Brücke-Kirche," a Bridge-Church. I propose in the remainder of this article to inquire more specifically what this title involves. The truth of it is obvious, at once, if only for this reason, that in no other Church in Christendom are the essential elements of Catholicism and Protestantism so adequately combined. The essentials of Catholicism are there: the ancient Creeds, the ancient liturgy, the ancient Orders; the Apostolic Succession—the fact of it, though no particular theory is officially countenanced. The essentials of Protestantism are there: the Bible as the rule of faith; the right of private judgment within reasonable limits; freedom for Christian thought and inquiry; and a personal relationship with God as the core and kernel of religion.

These categories are not mutually exclusive; they are complementary. Neither would be complete without the other, and it is evident that in any Catholic Church of the future each of these elements must have its proper place. For they indicate differences which go deep into human nature. Broadly speaking, there are two main avenues of approach to religion, the subjective and the objective. To those who belong to the first class, that which is of primary importance is their own inner experience of the things

unseen. They are at home in a church or a service wholly unadorned. It is not through the outward or the tangible that they seek God, but in the quiet of their own hearts, the spiritual illumination of their own minds. The other avenue of approach is equally valid and valuable—through the outward and visible, the tangible, the sacramental.

Both these ways of approach to the Eternal are recognized and provided for in the Anglican Communion as they are in the great Western Church from which she sprang. She stretches out her hand on one side to the Holy Orthodox Church of the East with its age-long dependence on the rock of an unchangeable deposit of faith; on the other hand to the evangelical believer with his exuberant joy in the spiritual experience of the moment. A celebration of the Holy Communion with every accompaniment of color and music, of dignity and ceremony, is as congenial but no more congenial to the Anglican tradition than the quiet celebration of the Holy Mysteries in some country church where there is nothing but the service itself to appeal to eye or ear. It is true that in the English Church up till now the quietist has been inadequately provided for. Our services are often too busy. There are not enough spaces for silence. Nor is there sufficient freedom in prayer or opportunity for personal witness for those who value such aids to the spiritual life. In the separation of the Puritans from the ancient family circle, and later of the Wesleyans,

we lost elements of Christian life and worship which can only be regained in a reunited Church.

For the present it may be impossible, or inadvisable, to provide those elements in the official services of the Church, but there ought to be, if only as one stage in our preparation for Reunion, more experiments than are at the moment in these methods, in prayer meetings and the like. There might well be a far greater variety of method in the conduct of retreats and quiet days. Be that as it may, within the framework of the Anglican Communion there is ample room for all and any experiments in such spiritual exercises, whether Catholic or Evangelical, provided that they do not depart from the New Testament as the norm of devotion.

As to the government of the Church—the Orders of the Ministry—it might well have been thought that here was a "Hill Difficulty" which it would be well-nigh impossible to scale. Difficult it is, but whereas a few years ago there seemed no path at all up that steep "hill," the first steps at least are becoming visible. In my dictionary "prelacy" is defined as "usually a hostile" word for episcopacy. That hostility was at one time (and not without reason) deep-seated in many minds and vehement in its expression, not least in the controversies of the seventeenth century, and the smoke of that hostility and controversy is still on occasion found floating in the air. It was due partly to worldly prelates and high-

handed methods, partly to totally divergent conceptions of authority in the Church. For the Church is not, as many suppose, a democracy, in which decisions are taken by the vote of the majority. It is a family in which the Fathers-in-God are the prime authorities, acting in consultation with the undershepherds, the clergy, and with the consent and cooperation of the laity. The fact that for this ideal there has been too often substituted the practical autocracy of the bishop goes some way at least to account for the suspicion with which, in some Churches, the office is still regarded.

Nor is this the only obstacle on the "Hill Difficulty." The point of view with which the priesthood is regarded is profoundly different in different Churches. Broadly speaking, the Catholic lays stress on what the priest offers or says to God on behalf of his people; whereas the Protestant lays stress on what the priest does or says to the people on behalf of God. As is sadly usual in such matters, the partizans of each standpoint have regarded the other as incompatible with their own, and have depreciated the ministry of worship on the one hand and the ministry of preaching on the other. It is time to recognize that in a reunited Church there must be ample recognition and ample use for both ministries, and that in fact they are and must frequently be combined in the same person. Here, too, the Church of England may claim to be a bridge-church, for normally the priest and the prophet are the same man, the parson—the "person"

par excellence—of the parish who leads the people in their worship and is at the same time their teacher and evangelist. True indeed it is that not every priest is a preacher or a prophet, as the converse is true, but there is no Church in Christendom which more consistently attempts to combine them. Here, at any rate, and preëminently, the offices can be often seen in happy and effective combination.

But to return to episcopacy. It is, in my judgment, entirely providential that at this juncture—when the Churches of Christendom are prepared to look to this Order as a needed foundation of unity in the reunited Church—there should have been a growing determination in the Church of England to restore the office of a bishop to something more resembling its primitive form, to make the bishop less of an ecclesiastical magnate and more of a father-in-God. This is the ideal which has inspired those who during the last century have worked, and often worked successfully, for the division of unwieldy dioceses into areas small enough for the father-in-God to have a really personal acquaintance with his clergy, and make some real contact with his lay-folk.[1] Nor can it be denied that the whole style and surrounding of the episcopate in

[1] Since 1850 eighteen new dioceses have been formed in England alone. There were then twenty-five dioceses; there are now forty-three. The case could hardly be better put than by the late Lord Curzon when he was Viceroy of India in regard to reducing the unwieldy areas of civil administration. "Government by one man is infinitely better than government by three men if it can be so managed. What we want . . . is personal knowledge of localities, and personal touch with the people. This can only be gained by the familiarity of the Head of the Administration with the places and people under his charge" (*Life of Lord Curzon,* vol. ii, p. 324).

the Church of England has during this period become less ornate, less pompous, simpler, more human.

Coincident with this movement has been another, whereby the laity are being introduced into and welcomed to a larger share than ever before in the management, and in some respects even government, of the Church. The movement found constitutional expression in the Church Assembly and in the Parochial Church Councils now set up in every part of the country. Side by side with these movements is still another, whereby the clergy are being restored to their constitutional right to consult with the bishop in the administration of the diocese; to express their judgment on questions which he may submit for their consideration. This consultation between the bishop and his clergy assembled in the sacred synod is only beginning to take shape, but it has received an immense impetus from what is commonly called "the Prayer Book crisis," for the bishops, put into an almost impossible position by the vote of the House of Commons, very naturally desired to know the mind of the clergy before determining on a policy which might be submitted to the judgment of the whole Church. It would be a grave mistake, however, to suppose that the summoning of these synods is an emergency measure caused by the present *impasse*. The whole question was considered by the Convocations in 1925 and the plan was approved and com-

mended.[1] This reëstablishment of constitutional consultation between bishop and clergy and of co-operation between bishop, clergy, and laity in the government of the Church is to be noted and pondered over, for it is here that the way seems opening up the "Hill Difficulty" in regard to Orders in the reunited Church.

This revived ideal of episcopacy was emphasized quite definitely in the Lambeth Appeal of 1920.

"We greatly desire that the office of a bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian family in the title of Father-in-God." [2]

I know of no more moving description of it than that of the late Bishop of Zanzibar, in whom it found a memorable example:

"Thus the bishop duly elected, consecrated, and installed is, mystically interpreted, the living, human symbol of the paternal authority of God accepted

[1] A Report on the whole subject was issued, and the following Resolution was passed: "That in matters which concern the clergy it is desirable to develop the principle of synodical action in the administration of dioceses; that, in order to carry this out, diocesan synods should be summoned by bishops of dioceses for the purpose of mutual consultation on matters concerning faith, worship, morals, discipline, and the pastoral office."

[2] *Lambeth and Reunion,* by the Bishops of Peterborough (now Winchester), Zanzibar, and Hereford, p. 3.

within His family the Church. He is, therefore, placed in a relation to his flock at once paternal and fraternal.

"It is paternal because he is entrusted with a revealed message for his people, which comes to them from outside themselves. It is fraternal because he is chosen by them from among themselves, and is, equally with them, bound to receive the message from above before he can hold it in trust for others. . . . In him they see one who represents every other congregation within their communion. And not that only. He represents every other congregation that ever existed within the historical Church. He is, in short, a representative of the whole Church to them. . . . He is bound at his consecration to be, to each individual, fatherly in his care for the body as well as the soul; fatherly in exercising spiritual discipline; fatherly in counsel; fatherly in setting a good example to his flock; and not least fatherly in providing that the outcast and lost be brought back to the fold. It is expected that his fatherly heart carry the burden of his flock before God. . . .

"The bishop is, ideally, a constitutional officer just because he is father-in-God. He is himself bound in conscience by the family traditions of faith and order. He is not free to reform the household according to his own individual prejudices. The members of the family have their rights. And in so far as he is ruler of the house, he is held to exercise his rule

constitutionally. In everything he does he acts with his clergy, in harmony with the laity. He is not a lord over God's heritage. Hence the importance of the diocesan synod. The bishop-in-synod, not the bishop alone, is the constitutional ruler of the local flock of Christ." [1]

It is worthy of note that this ideal of a constitutional episcopacy was accepted by the Joint Conference of representative Nonconformists and Anglicans which met at Lambeth in 1922 and the following year. These are their words:

"In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future.

"Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church." [2]

[1] *Lambeth and Reunion,* by the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar, and Hereford, pp. 79, 80, 81.

[2] *Reunion: The Lambeth Conference Report and the Free Churches,* p. 11.

In receiving this Report, the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches not unnaturally drew attention to the need for further investigation of the question, What is meant by a representative and constitutional Episcopate and how may the elements of presbyteral and congregational order be combined with it? An answer to this was attempted in a Memorandum adopted by the Joint Conference,[1] in which a constitutional Episcopate is defined as—

"an Episcopate which is exercised, not apart from, but in conjunction with, other forms of ecclesiastical authority, and especially the authority resident in the presbyterate and the yet larger and more fundamental authority that resides in the Church as a whole as guided by the Spirit of God,"

and in which it is pointed out that such a constitutional Episcopate already exists in most if not all parts of the Anglican Communion outside England.

"In them"—the branches of that Communion in other parts of the world—"the representative character of the bishop is unmistakable, for he is chosen by the Synod,[2] which itself rests upon the votes of the clergy and the Church members.

[1] Dated July 11, 1924. See *The Church of England and the Free Churches:* Proceedings of Joint Conferences held at Lambeth Palace, 1921-5, p. 57. Edited by G. K. A. Bell and W. L. Robertson.

[2] The word "synod" is here used somewhat loosely, and means the conference of clergy and laity.

"Again, in such Churches, the Bishop acts 'constitutionally'; for he has no legislative power apart from the presbyters and the laity. In his diocesan Synod the most that he can do is to withhold his agreement to some decision made by the clergy and laity, and so suspend its operation until appeal has been made to the final Church Authority.

"In the provincial Synod he is one among the other bishops of the province, and is limited by them." [1]

This ideal, too, is endorsed, though naturally not quite so explicitly, by the great Conference at Lausanne, in words to which the Conference agreed *nem. con.*:

"In view of (1) the place which the Episcopate, the Councils of Presbyters, and the congregation of the faithful, respectively, had in the constitution of the early Church, and (2) the fact that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational systems of government are each to-day, and have been for centuries, accepted by great communions in Christendom, and (3) the fact that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational systems are each believed by many to be essential to the good order of the Church, we therefore recognize that these several elements must all, under conditions which require further study, have

[1] *The Church of England and the Free Churches:* Proceedings of Joint Conferences held at Lambeth Palace, 1921-5, pp. 58, 59. Edited by G. K. A. Bell and W. L. Robertson.

an appropriate place in the order of life of a reunited Church, and that each separate Communion, recalling the abundant blessing of God vouchsafed to its ministry in the past, should gladly bring to the common life of the united Church its own spiritual treasures." [1]

I have dwelt at some length on this point not only because it is vital to the whole situation, but because it is "right here" that the difficulty looms largest and "right here" that the way seems opening for a solution. For assuming the remarkable volume of agreement in matters of Faith which was revealed at Lausanne, the question of Order, it would seem, is on the way to find solution along these lines. If this is so, and if, as in South India, definite plans for Reunion are formed, the problem of the "interim period" during the lifetime of existing ministries should not prove insuperable.

The Church of England, then, is indeed a "bridge Church." Within her borders are combined elements which exist separately in other Churches: at once Catholic and Evangelical, she seeks to draw together those who emphasize the objective, and those who emphasize the subjective in religion; those whose spiritual life is rooted in the Sacraments, and those whose normal approach to Christ lies more in the silent secrets of their own hearts; those who find their inspiration in the corporate life of the Church, and those who seek it more surely in their personal and

[1] *Faith and Order:* Lausanne, 1927, p. 469.

individual experience; those who anchor themselves in the historic tradition of the Faith, and those who glory in their present experience of its power; those who attach supreme value to an ordered ministry, and those who would more specially stress the work and witness—the priesthood in fact—of all believers; those who find their authoritative security in the Apostolic Succession of Fathers-in-God, with the continuity of the divine family which this implies, and those who are content to found themselves on the Bible and their own experience of its truths. *No one of these points of view is sufficient in itself; no one is exclusive of the others.*

It must be confessed that the Anglican Church has only partially succeeded in combining them in due proportion. At first sight the Prayer Book crisis seems wholly deplorable, if only because it tends to concentrate attention on domestic differences, and divert it from the far weightier matters of the Faith, and more especially this movement towards Reunion. There may, however, be another side to it. Deprived of the legal sanction which was sought for a wider *régime* of worship, the Church is compelled to build within its borders and by its own spiritual authority a new unity in diversity. We are in fact compelled to construct the framework of a reunited Church in which, through mutual self-denial and forbearance, room is made for our divergencies in reasonable proportion, but in which the members are drawn together

in a unity which far transcends these divergencies. And this because they have tasted of the love of Christ, and are aflame for the world-adventure for His Kingdom to which He has called them.

Just as the British Empire is called to be a specimen League of Nations, to afford a demonstration to the world of the way in which sovereign States, with all their divergent elements, can yet belong to one family and own one allegiance, so in the providential purpose of God, as I believe, the English Church is called to be the exhibition in Christendom of a Church with many divergent elements: fundamentally Catholic in doctrine and government, yet shot through with Evangelical fervor; utterly loyal to the Bible, yet open to learn whatever, through any avenue, the Spirit has to teach; in fact, to exhibit the specimen framework of a reunited Church. Whether the old Church can fulfil this high vocation depends on the degree in which her sons are able for the sake of the whole family to put on one side their preconceptions and predilections, can free themselves from the controversial spirit unfortunately revived by recent events, can forsake all loyalties narrower than the Kingdom of God, can, with humble and contrite hearts, make the will of God their sole ambition. Never, since the days of the Apostles, was a Church faced with a destiny so superb. Her sons will rise to it if it shall be said of them in this century that they were "not disobedient to the heavenly vision."

THE FREE CHURCHES IN ENGLAND

THE FREE CHURCHES IN ENGLAND

By The Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.
Principal of New and Hackney College, Deputy Chairman of the Lausanne Conference

(1) In dealing with the problem of Christian Reunion it is necessary to distinguish between *absolute spiritual* and *relative historical values*. The first only can claim the validity of religious convictions; the second can appeal only as practical considerations. If certainty can be asserted for the one, probability alone can be affirmed of the other. And nevertheless in most discussions on Faith and Order this distinction is ignored; and matters of Order, to which the relative historical value alone belongs, are treated as though they belonged to the content of Faith, for which alone the absolute spiritual values can be claimed. The only justification for a disregard of this distinction which can be offered is a proof (and it would need to be a very cogent proof) that the organization of the Church as it has developed in history belongs necessarily to the revelation of God and the redemption of man by Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. To prove, even if it could be proved, that Jesus gave instructions as to the organization of the society, which had its simple beginnings

in the small company of disciples whom He gathered around Him, would not in itself be enough, unless it could be shown that these instructions were not affected by the local and temporary conditions, under which the society was founded, and were by Him expressly intended to have permanent and universal authority.

To illustrate this general principle by a particular instance. To assert that Episcopacy belongs to the *esse* of the Christian Church, that consequently no ministry is regular or valid unless episcopally ordained, and no sacrament regular or valid unless celebrated by an episcopally-ordained minister, is to offer a judgment in which the absolute and the relative values are confused. To affirm, however, that Episcopacy belongs to the *bene esse* of the Church, if the conclusion is based on historical evidence, is to preserve the distinction. To justify the first statement it would be imperative to prove that Jesus Christ Himself instituted Episcopacy as the organization for His Church, which, as necessary for the realization of God's purpose in Him, must be always and everywhere accepted.

(2) Controversy is not congenial to me, and not congruous with the purpose of this volume of essays; and what follows is not written as controversy to prove views other than my own false, but in conciliation as showing in as tolerant and even appreciative a spirit as possible why for mutual under-

standing I advance these views as in my judgment true. I start from the New Testament; and there I accept the data that an impartial scholarship, which is not out to prove any doctrine or practice of later days as apostolic, supplies regarding the organization of the primitive Church, and there too I receive the conception of God's revelation and man's redemption in Christ Jesus which is dominant. I cannot myself find any justification for the assumption that Christ Himself imposed any organization—episcopal, presbyteral, or congregational—on His Church as alone permanently and universally valid or regular, because essential to the fulfilment of His purpose as Son of God and Saviour of men.

To begin the proof of "the reasonableness of the idea" that "Christ *founded* a visible Church" with the "witness of the early Christian belief in a visible Church" as found in the Fathers of the second and third centuries, as does Bishop Gore in his book *The Church and the Ministry,* and to read the New Testament with the bias that such a previous study must inevitably give, seems to me, with the highest possible respect for Bishop Gore himself, a putting of the cart before the horse, or even, however unintentionally, a loading of the dice in favor of one result of the inquiry. Supported by such eminent Anglican scholars as Lightfoot, Hort, and Hatch, not to mention any Nonconformist or Continental scholars, I feel justified in maintaining a distinction between

matters of order and contents of faith, based on the difference between the *absolute spiritual* and the *relative historical* values as a guiding principle of the subsequent discussion.

(3) What we must first of all ask ourselves is this: What is the conception of the nature of the Church, which is not only directly presented to us in the New Testament, but which is indirectly involved in the conceptions of God and man, and their mutual relation in Christ as the sole mediator between God and man, and as such all-sufficient as Saviour and all-sovereign as Lord? It has sometimes been stated that the word *church* (*ecclesia*) is used in the New Testament in three senses—the ideal, the actual Church in its unity or totality, and the Church as localized. This seems, however, a misleading way of putting the case. Recognizing the imperfections of the actual Church, Paul does not distinguish it from the ideal, but is ever exhorting believers as "called to be saints" to make the ideal actual. To accept this distinction involves the peril of acquiescence in the *status quo,* things as they are. The actual Church needs ever the encouragement or the warning of the ideal. The ideal is by the Spirit's presence and operation ever seeking and striving for full and clear manifestation in the actual.

Similarly, the total Christian community and the local Christian congregation are not instances of two different senses of the one word. It may be that, as

has been recently suggested by Martin Dibelius, the two usages suggest different associations: in the first, the primitive community claimed to be the assembly (*kahal*) of the true Israel, inheritor of its promises and privileges; in the second, the Gentile Christians assimilated their local organization to the assembly of Greek citizens. But the relation of the one to the other is not merely the quantitative one of whole and parts, but must be conceived rather qualitatively on the analogy of the divine omniscience. If it is Christ's presence in and with believers which constitutes His Church, then wherever He is present, His Church, not in parts but as a whole, is present.

It is on this ground, and this ground only, that I, as a Congregationalist, can justify my preference for the Congregational Order. The plea that Congregationalism has the advantage of being a more democratic mode of Church government leaves me icily cold. The claim of individual liberty to choose freely any mode of belief, worship, or polity seems to me just as irreligious and irreverent. The Church (the ideal and the actual, the total community and the local congregation) is essentially one because Christ is one, because the Father Whom He brings to men, and to Whom He brings men as His children, is one, because the Spirit Whom He imparts to all, united to Himself by faith, is one. The unity of the Church is no less of its essence than of the essence of God Himself. As the body of Christ the Church continues

His incarnation in the world; it is His voice, hands, feet, to fulfil God's redemptive purpose in Him. As the Church is the community (*koinonia*) of the Holy Spirit, not only is the Holy Spirit "the common possession" of all believers, but they are thereby made one in the fellowship of the Spirit.

Thus does the Church become the Temple of God, in worship and work alike realizing His presence. As such, the Church has absolute spiritual value. It is not merely a historical institution, founded by and dependent on the will of men. It is based on the eternal purpose of God; it was historically realized in the revealing and redeeming person and work of Jesus Christ; it is sustained by the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit. Men become members of it only as, united by faith to Christ, they possess the Spirit, and so live a life which is "hid with Christ in God." The Church so conceived is essential to human salvation and divine sovereignty as mediated by Jesus Christ the Saviour and Lord.

(4) As man is embodied spirit, and God is present and active in the visible universe, so the Church must find manifestation under the conditions of time and space, giving sensible evidence of its reality. The truth and grace of Christ were manifested in the preaching of the Gospel by the sensible evidence of speaking and hearing. The human fellowship, which faith in Christ constituted, was manifested in the intercourse of the disciples with their Master and

with one another. Entrance into this fellowship was manifested in baptism, and continuance in this fellowship in the Supper. The description of the Church as the body of Christ implies such manifestation. For *inspiration* is ineffective without *organization.* It is no proof of a more spiritual view of the Church to depreciate organization. There must be no more, but just as much organization as will make the inspiration fully effective. If truth and grace can be imparted to man more fully by sacraments along with the Gospel than by the Gospel alone, it is no proof of a superior spirituality to reject the sacraments even if the person rejecting does not himself experience their value, for he should have a loving regard for those for whom they have value. If a ministry, set apart for specific function, makes more effective the work of the Church, the rejection of such a ministry is the refusal to allow the Divine Spirit to use the fittest instrument. It is often said that we need to attend more to the *dynamics* than to the *mechanics* of the Church, the sources of its power rather than the methods of its work. But in mechanics we have applied dynamics; power needs machinery to work. Accordingly I am in full agreement with those who lay stress on the Church's need of organization, its sensible manifestation for effective operation.

Further, if unity is of the very essence of the Church, the organization will be defective as it con-

ceals or hinders that unity, and adequate as it reveals and realizes it. The desire which is spreading ever more widely for the manifestation of the essential unity, despite the difficulties which existing conditions present, and the disappointments which attend the effort to actualize the ideal, is not a wayward human wish, but is the steadfast will of God. The ideal Church which has absolute spiritual value is one; and the actual Churches with their relative historical values approximate to that absolute spiritual value as they approach the manifestation of that unity.

(5) The divine purpose is fulfilled by human agency; the manifestation of the spiritual reality is historical, under conditions of time and space; and it is no less an error to identify the spiritual reality with its manifestation than to deny the need of such manifestation. Creed, ritual, polity, have, and can have, only a relative historical value, and not the absolute spiritual value of the love of God, the grace of Christ, or the community of the Spirit. If it cannot be proved (and the writer is convinced that it cannot be proved) that Christ gave to His Church in its manifestation an organization which He meant to be permanent and universal, then the creed, the ritual, and the polity of the Church are to be judged as all historical developments must be judged, relative on the one hand to the end to be accomplished, and on the other hand to the means which the local

and temporary situation afforded. Can it be claimed that the organization of the Church has so perfectly realized the intention of Christ in His revealing and redeeming purpose that it possesses the same absolute value? Can it be claimed that the conditions under which the Church's development began were so perfect as to afford for its varied manifestations the adequate forms for all times and all places? The Jewish synagogue, the Gentile club, the mystery religions, the current philosophy, the imperialism of Rome,—all did exercise an influence on the evolution of the historical characteristics of the Church. To treat the whole movement as a secularization of Christianity, a corruption of the simple and pure Gospel of Jesus, is an error due to lack of discernment of "the guiding hand of God" in the necessities of the historical situation, amid the mistakes and wrongs of men. No less of an error does it seem to be to invest the details of that development with divine sanction, with an absolute authority.

If, then, we are at liberty to scrutinize and to criticize, in the true sense of the word, the history of the Church, even in the early centuries, there are two principles of judgment which may be applied, one negative and the other positive. (i) The unity of the Church as the spiritual reality, essential to its very nature and needing to be manifested in and to the world, does not demand uniformity. In the primitive community there were the Jewish and the

Gentile type; and schism was avoided because uniformity was not demanded. (ii) There was adaptation to the environment of the converts. In the peril from persecution, heresy, schism, the Church sought to preserve its unity by a growing insistence on uniformity; but this at every stage involved the exclusion of some Christians, and *catholic* doctrine and practice can claim that distinction only by ignoring the defeated minority, and regarding the triumphant majority alone.

(6) Even if the historical necessity of just this and no other development could be proved, it does not follow that what has thus emerged in history as creed, ritual, and polity may not have survived the conditions of that necessity. If there is to be any useful and hopeful discussion of Christian Reunion, there must be an open mind allowed to others by those whose minds may be closed on these questions by their distinctive convictions. An illustration will make plain what is meant. Non-episcopalians may be asked to accept the Episcopate as by its history having a claim to be included in the polity of any United Church of the future; but they should not be asked to assent to any theory of "the apostolic succession" in "the historic Episcopate." No such assent has been required in, for instance, the Church of England; and it would be a mistake and wrong to attempt to impose any such condition on Nonconformists. It might be agreed that in future all

ordinations in the United Church should require the presence of a bishop; but that agreement should not be held to involve the admission that the bishop's presence is essential for the communication of the divine grace to expectant and responsive faith. To avoid doubt and scruple in the minds of any recipients of the Eucharist it might be conceded that this sacrament in future should be administered only by episcopally-ordained men; but that concession should not be taken as a confession of necessary defect in any sacrament otherwise administered. The writer is not here insisting that these demands should be made, or should be granted; but only indicating the conditions under which such demands could be made with any probable prospect of consideration.

Such a demand could plead justification only for two reasons. *Firstly*, it would need to be proved that the development for which such exclusive claims are made had been found at every stage adequately effective as an agent of the divine purpose, showing alike in religious experience, moral character, and social influence an unchallengeable superiority to every other development within the Church. *Secondly*, it would need to be proved that those other developments could not plead any historical justification as necessary corrections of the defects of this development, and could not show by their fruits that God had owned and blessed them in their service for His glory. Whether in the given historical conditions

the unity of the Church could have been preserved and should have been preserved is too complex an historical problem for any confident solution. In every division in the Christian Church there were error and wrong on both sides, in the excluding majority and the excluded minority, in the rebellion against and the tyranny of ecclesiastical authority. And without condemnation of good men who acted according to the light given to them, all Christians may not only regret, but even as members of the one body repent of, the sins which in former generations led to divisions. But God, Who makes even the wrath of men to praise Him, has so corrected those divisions that the manifold wisdom of God, the riches of His grace, have been manifested; neglected truths have been restored to their proper place in Christian thought; fresh types of piety have been developed which have enlarged the range of Christian experience; defects of character have been exposed in persecutors, and sometimes even in persecuted, and excellences of character have been stimulated in the endurance of wrong, for the enlargement of the Christian conscience.

What the history shows is that no part of the Church can exalt itself over any other part; each part should recognize its own defects, and the excellences of other parts. If under the providence of God, with the guidance of His Spirit, different types of creed, ritual, and polity have emerged, the con-

clusion is forced upon us that uniformity cannot be insisted on, that liberty must be granted, that charity must be exercised, that the unity in the outward manifestation which is to be sought for and striven after must not be exclusive, but comprehensive, so that each sundered part when joined again in the whole shall be allowed to bring its own distinctive contribution of truth and grace.

(7) A continuance of the present situation, even if the strain of it were relieved by an abundant appreciation and coöperation of the different Churches, would not do justice to the need of, and desire for, the manifestation of the unity of the Church. A federation of Churches, which excluded the common ministry and the common sacraments, would not be enough; and would be a hindrance to the needed and desired unity, if deemed enough. An organic unity, involving uniformity of creed, ritual, polity, seems at present impracticable, even if it were desirable, and I believe that the attempts to enforce uniformity in the past have shown that it is not desirable. What then without such uniformity is imperative for the manifestation of unity?

(*a*) The acceptance of the historical revelation of God and the historical redemption of man in Jesus Christ is basic. Interpretation of some of the facts may vary, and room must be left for literary and historical criticism of the documents; but I at least cannot think of a United Church which did not con-

fess Jesus Christ as divine Saviour and Lord. Without asserting the adequacy for the thought of to-day of the metaphysics of the Nicene Creed, or the literal historicity of every article of the Apostles' Creed, the United Church would declare itself in real and vital continuity of faith with these confessions of "the things most surely believed." An elaborate symbol such as the Thirty-nine Articles or the Westminster Confession would be an insuperable obstacle; but the historical Creeds need not, so long as they are regarded with all their inadequacy as historical monuments of the common faith of Christians.

(*b*) The greater difficulty is not in Faith, but in Order. What seems imperative, despite the difficulty, is the manifestation of the unity in a common ministry, accepted as valid or regular by all, and common sacraments, to be received without doubt or scruple by all. Inter-celebration of the Eucharist by all the Churches will alone adequately manifest the essential unity of the Church. This cannot be the first step, but must be the last, if violence is not to be done to what we may broadly describe as the Catholic in contrast to the Protestant view, although there are Protestant Churches on the Continent and in America which from the standpoint of English Nonconformity could in this respect be described as Catholic. There is not, as is often assumed, inter-celebration in all sections of Lutheranism and the Reformed Churches; for in some of these Churches

participation in the one table is not a sign of the common Christian Faith, but rather a seal of the distinctive interpretation of that Faith by Luther or by Calvin. Not all the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches are equally exclusive in this respect, as in Stockholm the Lutheran and in Lausanne the Reformed Churches offered to the members of the respective Conferences free access to a common table. In justice it must be stated that Anglo-Catholicism is not the only obstacle to this "consummation devoutly to be wished." While I myself would be glad to offer the sacramental elements to any fellow-Christian, or to receive them from any ministerial hands, I do recognize and respect the scruples and doubts felt by those who hold the Catholic position. As this contrast must be harmonized, if the needed and desired unity is to be obtained, it demands further, even if brief, consideration.

(8) Although it is difficult to state with absolute accuracy and adequate appreciation a position which one does not oneself hold, the attempt must here be made to state the Catholic position. In the sacraments a distinctive grace of God is imparted, which cannot be received by any other means. That it is this distinctive grace which is being received is guaranteed, not only by the proper words and acts being used, but by the qualifications of the celebrant to discharge this function as a minister of Christ. It is only the episcopally-ordained ministry which can

offer this guarantee of qualification for this function. And the Episcopate which can ordain a ministry so qualified must be in the apostolic succession, a continuous channel of the grace of ordination from the Apostles themselves. Without at present discussing whether the theory is true or not, the consequences are obvious. The recipient of the sacrament can be sure that he is receiving the distinctive grace it conveys only when it is administered by a minister ordained by a bishop in the apostolic succession. That some grace may be, nay is, received by the believing recipient of the sacrament not so guaranteed is not denied, unless by those who hold this theory in an extreme form; but the grace is not so definite or so certain. The testimony of the personal experience of believers in non-episcopal Churches demands this concession; the theory itself requires such a limitation to be put upon it. I have avoided using the terms valid or regular, as question-begging epithets, and tried to put the theory in language understood of the people.

(9) It is more difficult to describe the Protestant position; since it allows a much wider range of difference. I cannot claim in stating my own view to speak even for Congregationalists generally; but it is a view which in my judgment does not involve an abandonment of the Protestant position.

(*a*) The sacrament of the Lord's Supper allows a more exact description than that of Baptism, and

therefore attention may be confined to it. The sacrament is not only a sign of the reconciling and redeeming grace of Christ, nor even only a seal of the fulfilment of the divine promise of grace unto faith; but when received in faith, it becomes a channel of grace, for Christ Himself is present and active, imparting His own life to be the believer's life; since he is being nourished and refreshed inwardly by the Bread from Heaven and the Water of Life. The spiritual reality of the experience is the same as that claimed by the Catholic, however different may be the psychology or the metaphysics of the explanation offered; but two differences from the Catholic view may be indicated. *Firstly,* while the experience of grace in the sacrament may for many believers be more intense and certain than in any other means, it is no distinctive grace that is received; for can Christ be divided? can He give more and other than Himself, as He does when the Gospel is preached and believed? *Secondly,* this view lays stress on the presence of the Risen Lord in the wholeness and fullness of His personality; but does not attach any exclusive value to corporeal presence, as body and soul or spirit are one inseparable unity in personality. The value of the sacrament is not made dependent in any way on the minister, who celebrates; for to every recipient grace is given according to faith.

(*b*) Who shall celebrate is not, however, a matter

of indifference. The administration of the sacraments is a corporate function of the Church, not a function which any believer may at his own pleasure claim for himself, but a function which the Church entrusts to the persons whom it chooses to represent it, because it believes that they have been called of God, and equipped by God so to be the agents of its common life and work. The ordination is as a human act the confirmation by the Christian community of this divine call and equipment, and as a sacrament becomes to the recipient, as does the Eucharist, a channel of grace, an increase of the spiritual equipment already possessed. Admitting that when and where it is necessary, the ordinance of the Supper may be administered by a layman, it follows from the vocation of the minister, and his ordination, that he as the representative of the community should ordinarily discharge this corporate function.

(*c*) As this ordination is not to the ministry of a congregation, or a denomination, but to the ministry of the Church of Jesus Christ, even when the ordination takes place in a congregation, this universal character, not local or sectional, should be made manifest in the participants in the act of ordination; and all ordinations, whether by a group of ministers invited by the congregation as the representatives of sister-Churches, or by the ministers authorized by the presbytery, or even by the bishop, unless the theory of apostolic succession is accepted, fail to

express adequately this universal character. Hence apart from the question of the administration of the sacraments altogether, it seems, even from the Protestant position, as I hold it, necessary that we should seek for, and strive after, a ministry which will manifestly, as well as in inward conviction, have this universal character.

(10) It must be admitted that the early origin, the long continuity, the wide diffusion of the Episcopate in the Christian Church make it an appropriate, nay, the most appropriate, organ for making manifest this universal character of the Christian ministry. This, however, is here offered as a judgment not of absolute spiritual, but of relative historical, value. But as in the historical development of the Church, which has not been outside of the divine providence, nor without the Spirit's guidance, the presbyteral and the congregational type of polity have emerged, and have proved their value alongside of the episcopal, it seems no less appropriate that these elements of Church Order should be represented as well as the episcopal in the ordination which makes manifest this universal character of the ministry of the one Church of Christ. To restrict the function of ordination to the Episcopate would be, in my judgment, to obscure the truth that the ministry is from the whole Church and to the whole Church as the body of Christ, the channel of His presence and activity.

Passing from the subject of ordination to that of

the polity generally, this desire to make manifest the wholeness of the Church leads us to the conclusion that the spiritual elements, for which each of these types stands, should be duly combined. The Congregational type asserts the liberty in Christ of the Christian people; the presbyteral type the equality of all the ministers of Christ; the episcopal the authority of the Church as a whole over the parts. A polity which will not ignore the lessons of history, but conserve its gains, will combine these three elements. I do not suggest that any of the existing polities can be combined without any modification; but I am confident that a polity can be devised which will preserve what is valuable in each of these elements. In a Memorandum, in the drafting of which I was associated with the Bishop of Truro, submitted to the Joint Conference of Anglicans and Nonconformists at Lambeth Palace, an attempt was made to sketch such a polity. In such a polity the Episcopate would be representative of clergy and laity, and under the constitution entrusted with certain corporate functions as thus representative. While I am convinced that Nonconformists might accept such an Episcopate without surrender of any essential principle, Episcopalians in accepting it would not be making any new concessions. Outside of Great Britain, the Anglican Church already possesses such a constitutional representative Episcopate; and within the Church of England itself, ac-

ceptance of the theory of apostolic succession is not and never has been required.

(11) The obstacle which has not yet been removed does not lie in the future constitution of the Church: it lies in the transition from the present situation. It would be an offense to the conscientious convictions of many Anglicans that a minister, not episcopally ordained, should celebrate the Eucharist; and they could not without doubt or scruple accept the Elements from his hands. It would be no less an offense to the conscientious convictions of all Nonconformists, so far as they have found utterance, for ministers already ordained to submit to a second ordination in order to qualify them to administer this ordinance, in all the churches, whether episcopal or not. Is there any way out of the *impasse?* To accept any kind of episcopal ordination seems to Nonconformists an inevitable repudiation of the previous ordination. An ordination *sub conditione* would be equivocal, for the intentions of the ordaining bishop and the ordained minister would not be the same: the one would intend to confer what the other would not intend to receive.

Many Anglicans find it difficult to understand the Nonconformist objection. For Anglicans ordination seems to be an ordinance, which might be more or less valid or regular, and the defect of which might be remedied. For Nonconformists—and here I am entirely at one with my brethren—it is a personal

experience of relation to Christ, which is so unique that it cannot be repeated, for repetition would cast doubt on, or offer a challenge to, the sufficiency of the grace of Christ to make a man His minister, appointed and equipped for his vocation. A more feasible suggestion is this, that during the period of transition there should not be inter-celebration in the sense of non-episcopally ordained ministers celebrating in churches accustomed to an episcopally ordained ministry, and *vice versa.* To forbid such inter-celebration, however, where and when desired, and possible without offense to any man's conscience, would be to thrust division into the unity. To provide that such inter-celebration should not be imposed, where there remained any unwillingness, would be simply a consideration for conscientious convictions. To fix a period after which all ordinations must be episcopal would be to show a distrust of the effective working of the Spirit of God within the United Church towards the harmonizing of differences.

(12) I do not deceive myself with the expectation that this unity, in my judgment both necessary and possible, will be speedily achieved. The majority of Christian people do not recognize its necessity from either standpoint, the world's need or the Church's good; and are so bound by the traditions and conventions of their own denomination that they are entirely indifferent. A minority, which is interested,

is hostile, because it has not yet learned to distinguish the relative historical and the absolute spiritual values; any change in creed, ritual, polity, is to them an endangering of the ark of God, a taking away of the Lord. Some who are convinced both of the necessity and the possibility are hesitant lest they should be regarded as ungrateful for the past history, or disloyal to the present principles of their own Communion.

Some who have frankly and boldly advocated this movement towards Reunion have found themselves described as traitors, and charged with selling the pass, for partizanship ignores the possibility of being faithful and devoted to one's own Communion, so long as these separations continue, and yet responsive to the summons of the Spirit of God to seek after and strive for that universal community of the Spirit, in which all the Communions will blend their distinctive contributions of truth and grace in creed, ritual, or polity. But God be praised that the conviction is deepening that God wills unity. The interest is spreading in all movements towards unity. The term of reproach of the Papal Encyclical *pan-Christian* is becoming a title of honor, for Christian wholeness waits on Christian oneness. From "the head, even Christ, all the body, fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in *due* measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the

building up of itself in love: till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: in Whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord . . . for a habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. iv:16, 13; ii:21, 22).

THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH

THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH

By The Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.

Ex-Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, Ex-President of Wesleyan Methodist Conference

The present moment is favorable for a dispassionate survey of the conditions and prospects of Christian Reunion. And this just because a reaction has followed upon the enthusiasm of the Lambeth Appeal, which enables us to study both the Ideal and the hard facts of the existing situation in relation to one another. If progress is to be made in realizing the ideal, it is needful to treat the reaction not merely as a discouraging set-back, but as inevitable, and, therefore, as bringing influential factors to light that must be dealt with in a much profounder and more spiritual way than by any exercise of ecclesiastical statesmanship.

The ideal of Reunion must needs hold the field. The positions that have been captured can never be surrendered. And this for many constraining reasons. The demand for unity is so organic in Christian faith and life as to be ceaseless in its striving for satisfaction and fulfilment. Directly men are brought to recognize with St. Paul that there is "one hope of their calling; one Lord, one faith, one bap-

tism, one God and Father of all, Who is over all, and through all, and in all," they must needs declare that "there is *one body,* and one Spirit" (Eph. iv: 4-6). Unity of spirit in any sphere demands thoroughgoing outward and even institutional expression. Above all must this be the case where such unity springs from a common relationship to one Who is "in all," as well as "over all, and through all." The intimacy of this mystical relationship involves, by its very nature, a consequential intimacy of spiritual fellowship as well as of practical coöperation. The Epistle to the Ephesians is the classic exposition of this essential truth, and is, therefore, the guide-book to the meaning of Christian unity and to the conditions that govern its fulfilment.

Naturally this supreme law of Christian life finds confirmation and reinforcement in every sphere of spiritual concern and practical endeavor. The ascertainment and the application of Christian principles in every realm of human relationship—social, national, and international—demand it. Still more, spiritual progress is hindered and warped without it. Denominationalism, because it is selective, tends to become exclusive. The premises that support our denominational divisions, whether they be historical, dogmatic, or spiritual, tend to become fortifications, armed for polemic encounters with those whose equally partial Christianity has been reared upon different selections of formative presuppositions and prejudices. Hence

arises sectarianism with its narrowness and bitterness impoverishing Christian thought and injuring the free and full growth of Christian character. All sectarianism must needs become provincial rather than truly Catholic and Evangelical.

The manifold evils that are involved are only partially mitigated by the fact that Christians of all denominations inherit a common primitive tradition, are instructed by thought and are enriched by devotion that literature must needs make common to them all. It is indeed the strangest irony of human affairs that our community of Christian faith and experience should be fostered by the departed and the impersonal, while refusing the frank and full contacts of universal fellowship with the living.

The force of all these considerations has been brought home to Christians throughout the world as the effect of the modern situation, and especially of the Great War. The movement towards Reunion sprang up indeed before the war. It gained characteristic utterance in the American proposal of a World-Conference on Christian Faith and Order, which resulted in the Lausanne Conference of 1927. It only took practical shape, however, in the Lambeth "Appeal to all Christian People," which was issued in 1920 by the Anglican Bishops, and has been followed, in England, by prolonged and intimate conversations between the representatives of the Anglican Church on the one hand, and of the

Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches on the other. Thus the quest of Reunion has been brought down from the realm of pious aspiration into that of practical politics. Whatever may happen in the immediate future, it is certain that the ideal can never again be exiled from the domain of the actual.

It was inevitable that the chief parties to the discussions which have arisen from the Lambeth Appeal should approach the subject from their particular historic starting-points. The Lambeth Appeal was characteristically Anglican. It proposed Reunion on the basis of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, namely, the acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as divinely authoritative, of the Œcumenical Creeds, of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and of a universally acknowledged Ministry. This last requirement means the acceptance of Episcopacy—its authority and ordination, though of a "constitutional Episcopate," which recognizes the rights of the Presbyterate and the position of the laity in the government of the reunited Church. The subsequent conversations with the Free Church representatives led the Anglicans to the momentous declaration that in their judgment the duly recognized non-episcopal ministries "are true Ministries of the Word and Sacraments in Christ's Universal Church"—a declaration the full significance of which still remains to be followed out to its consequences, as well as to be

authoritatively and universally accepted by the Anglican Church. Hence the historic Anglican ideal of comprehensiveness under an Episcopal Order is maintained, though an extended and more flexible application is given to it. To this proposal the Roman reply has been given to the usual effect, namely, that the way of Reunion is ever open: that of submission to the Pope as the infallible and autocratic earthly Head of the Church of Christ. The Evangelical non-Episcopal Churches have, in the same way quite inevitably, replied by emphasizing unity of faith and experience as constituting the only true Christian unity, and have been inclined to use this fundamental principle to the disparagement of unity of Church Order, and even in some cases to the denial of its advantage.

Hence the advocates of Reunion are confronted by the age-long tension between Faith and Order—between the freedom of the Spirit and the rule of Authority. The former must needs lay stress upon the personal and subjective elements of true religion, upon unfettered spontaneity in faith and thought, upon adventurous exploration of the "trackless riches" of Christ, with its attendant criticism, and of free fellowship in common experience and pursuit. The latter insists upon its counter-affirmations of objectivity in religion, of uniformity regulated by authority, of submission to this authority as the condition and even the meaning of fellowship, and all

this in order, not to the acquisition of fresh truth, but to the safeguarding and enjoyment of a permanent inheritance conveyed by the past and bounded by the frontiers of the Church. Thus there is conflict both between and within Christian Communions. The Faith that seeks expression and safety in order is constantly hampered by the very Order it creates, while the Order that claims to rest upon the Faith that created it, and of which it forms a part, is driven to look upon Faith as its foe, whenever Faith claims to breathe its vital air and to exercise its characteristic energy of freedom. Order tends to become external and restrictive, from time to time even oppressive, as it breaks away from Faith, in the largest and deepest sense of the word, while Faith, under these conditions, tends either to sink into mere acquiescence or to break out in fierce and sometimes lawless revolt.

The history of the Christian Church is the record of this age-long alternation of the alliance and the conflict between Faith and Order.

As this chapter is written by a Wesleyan Methodist, some remarks should here be made as to the meaning and position of Methodism. Its history is in many ways an illustration of the relations between Faith and Order, both in coöperation and in conflict. Methodism arose in a reaction against the religious torpor of the eighteenth century and as a practical

remedy for its attendant evils. Its original aim was to regain the devotion and to restore the pattern of primitive Christianity. The effort to accomplish this revealed to the Wesleys and their associates the necessity of a renewal of the primitive personal experience of Christ if the primitive standard of life was to be reached. Hence the revival of religion, by which their quest was rewarded, renewed the personal experience of reconciliation with God in and through Christ, the life of the Spirit and the full assurance of faith. Thereby it superseded the predominance of sovercignty and law in the interpretation of God by that of love, and, therefore, realized once more the primacy of love as the very essence and spring of true religion. The revival of this faith was followed, as in Apostolic times, by the new intimacy of fellowship, with the result that Faith, working through fellowship, created a new Order as indispensable both to the maintenance of internal fellowship and to the universal proclamation of the Gospel. This Order sprang up under the influence of the Spirit, yet, as at the first, in free and flexible response to the needs of the practical situation. Hence Methodism was at once Catholic in creed and tradition and was Evangelical in experience. And the Catholic creed was vivified and so preserved and disseminated by this new and vital experience.

Yet, while Methodism by its origin and aims was unencumbered by past controversies between Faith

and Order, renewed conflicts between them subsequently arose within its own borders, with the result that, while the Methodists have remained one in faith, Methodism has been broken into denominational fragments. Happily these breaches of its unity are being repaired throughout the world, and there is good hope, at the present time, of the speedy reunion of the three great branches of British Methodism. If this great result be attained, it will be due to the significant fact that Faith has once more exercised its rightful supremacy over Order, so restoring its vitality and flexibility as to enable it to satisfy, in due proportion, and so to reconcile the conflicting claims that led to the disastrous separations.

The position is as follows. Methodism has long ago healed its divisions in Ireland, Canada, and Australia. At the decennial Methodist Œcumenical Conference held in London in 1901, the reunion of the branches of British Methodism was advocated by some of the speakers, and ten years later the subject was more fully referred to at the Œcumenical Conference in Toronto. In 1913 the British Wesleyan Conference in its Representative Session passed a resolution to set on foot an inquiry into the practicability of reunion between the Wesleyan, the Primitive, and the United Methodist Churches—the last body consisting of the Methodist New Connection, the United Methodist Free Churches, and the Bible Christians, having come into existence through a

scheme of reunion in 1907. Informal conferences between representatives of the three denominations were held as the result of the Resolution of 1913 with such hopeful results that in 1919 the three Conferences undertook a joint and official inquiry into the possibility of reunion, and as to the terms upon which it could be effected.

Eventually a scheme was prepared which after consideration by the three Conferences was sent down to the Synods in 1921 and to the Circuit Quarterly Meetings and Trustees throughout the country in 1923, and was approved by a considerable majority of the latter with, in many cases, a large preponderance of votes.

The chief difficulty has lain, not in matters of Faith, as to which all parties are agreed, but as to Order, and particularly as to the position of the Ministry in the Church—the question upon which the secessions of the nineteenth century had chiefly turned. The difficulty of reunion had been greatly lessened by the admission of lay representatives to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in 1878, the questions of doctrine, discipline, admission and stationing of ministers, and pastoral oversight being reserved to the Pastoral Session of the Conference. Hence when the inquiry took place, it was found that the demands of the Primitive Methodist and United Methodist Churches in regard to the position of the laity had been substantially met, and that the rep-

resentatives of these two Churches were prepared to accept a Pastoral Session of the Conference to deal with the ministerial questions just enumerated, with the trifling exception that the annual stationing of ministers should be recommended to the Ministerial Session of the Conference, by a joint Committee of ministerial and lay representatives.

This scheme was provisionally adopted by the three Conferences in 1919 and after final revision in 1926. It has, however, been provided that no steps to effect reunion should be taken unless supported at every stage by a majority of at least 75 per cent. of the three Conferences, and in the case of the Wesleyan Methodist Church by at least the same majority in both the Representative and the Pastoral Sessions of the Conference. This condition involves a 75 per cent. majority in support of the application to Parliament for an Enabling Bill—the tenure of trust property being affected—and subsequently similar majorities in each Conference and in the preliminary Uniting Conference, before union can be finally effected. In 1927 the majorities in support of the scheme and of the application to Parliament were amply sufficient in the Primitive and United Methodist Conferences, but insufficient in the Wesleyan Methodist Conference. Hence a temporary deadlock took place.

A further inquiry followed, and eventually a compromise was effected, to which influential leaders

of the Wesleyan Methodist minority gave their support. This compromise provided for reunion, in three stages, subject to the requisite majorities being secured. The first stage is the application for the Enabling Bill in the Parliamentary Session of 1928-9. The second stage provides for the full working out of the scheme in details and in its local application (it being provided that no local fusion of churches and circuits shall take place without local assent). The third stage comprises a systematic regional endeavor to secure the spiritual and practical conditions of successful reunion, the whole process to be completed by 1932. This plan was adopted in the Conferences of 1928, and the approach to Parliament directed by the Primitive Methodist Conference by a majority of 95 per cent., by the United Methodist Conference by a majority of 95 per cent., and by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference by a majority of 89 per cent. in the Representative Session and by 77 per cent. majority in the Pastoral Session. As far as can be ascertained, the utmost goodwill now prevails, and the Enabling Bill is to be introduced forthwith, while the Regional Committees are already getting to work.

This brief and imperfect survey of the past is sufficient to lay bare the nature and difficulty of the problem of Reunion. Apart from and beneath particular differences lies the fundamental question of reconciling and harmoniously uniting two comple-

mentary and compensatory elements—Faith and Order, Freedom and Authority—under the hegemony of a faith so truly catholic as to mean unity of spiritual attitude towards Christ, thus bringing about a corresponding unity of beliefs about Him and accord in the principles that should direct the service rendered to Him by all His people in fellowship with one another. The interplay between Faith and Order is essential; the tension between the two must, under existing conditions, frequently be serious.

The gravity and, for the time being, the insolubility of this problem has been strikingly illustrated by the Malines Conversations and by the Papal Encyclical which followed them. In the view taken here it was inevitable and desirable that these Conversations should take place. Inevitable, because the Lambeth Appeal was addressed "To all Christian People" throughout the world, and because universality is of the vital essence of the endeavor to achieve Reunion. Desirable, because it is important to know how matters stand at the present time, and also because the cause of truth, as well as of unity, cannot be either Christianly or effectively promoted by mere controversy from without, but demands united and friendly research, carried on, so far as may be, "in the bond of peace." The drawback of the Conversations was that those who took part in them on the Anglican side were hardly qualified to represent all the interests at stake, and that,

perhaps because of this, the Conversations began and ended on a very important and yet upon a subordinate subject, that of rival theories of Authority and Jurisdiction in the Church of Christ. That this was the case is made clear by the published record of the proceedings. It was confessed by one of the Anglicans, who wished "to insist afresh that organization is relatively of secondary importance and that the dogmas are the things of primary importance," to which the Roman Catholics replied that "there is among Anglicans a freedom in matters of belief which appears to be excessive, and a hindrance to unity" (Report, p. 38). An attempt to draw an abstract distinction "between fundamental and non-fundamental articles" was turned down by the Roman Catholics (p. 40), while one of the Anglicans was of opinion that the duty of the Conference "was to bring increasingly to light all that may promote the cause of union, but to set aside or postpone all that would put difficulties in the way" (p. 75). Hence the Conversations turned mainly upon the jurisdiction of the Pope, either apart from or in conjunction with the Episcopate, either Œcumenical or Provincial, or, in the case of reunion with the Anglican Church, sectional. Thus the weightier and underlying matters were "set aside or postponed."

The really fundamental question is that of Faith. And this not as the submissive acceptance of "dogmas" ascertained, formulated—with their impli-

cations and presuppositions—and imposed by Authority, but in its free and energetic exercise, both personal and collective, upon the Gospel. This involves the duty, the right, and the responsibility of the Christian community as a whole to coöperate in seeking to establish and unfold the contents of the Faith in coherence and not conflict with all other truth, in unfettered response to all the needs and in sympathetic recognition of all the true values of human life, with power to maintain the identity of the Faith, not by slavish adherence to the past, but in living response to the unfolding of the present and the prospects of the future, so far as these are disclosed. In the long run conformity with rule can only be brought about by the satisfaction of mind, and not by the bare submission of will. Hence agreement must first be reached as to the meaning of Faith, and as to its relation to any kind of Order, before the particular question of *what* Order can fruitfully be raised.

So far as this last question is concerned, and without entering into details, it is safe to say that Reunion cannot be brought about by arrangements between bishops as to their jurisdiction to which the Church must simply submit; that not the mere primacy of the Pope but the whole subject of the Papacy must be brought under effective review; that both an autocracy and an oligarchy in the Church

are incompatible with modern conditions, with spiritual life, indeed with the inmost nature of the Church itself; and, finally, that the constitution of the Anglican Church as a "Uniate" Communion within the Roman Church, with the Pope "restricting himself to dealing directly with the Archbishop of Canterbury" as its "recognized leader" (p. 22), yet "in exceptional cases 'intervening' in full power" (p. 34), is not only so impossible as to be almost ridiculous, but is inconsistent with any adequate ideal of Reunion.

That these Conversations have proved abortive is clearly shown by the Papal Encyclical *De vera Religionis Unitate fovenda* of January 6, 1928, which, while certainly aimed at Lausanne, was probably intended also to glance off upon Malines.

All that has taken place since the Lambeth Appeal, culminating in the Malines Conversations, has shown that any complete and universal Reunion is, at present, impracticable and indeed, under existing conditions, undesirable. Only when unity of spirit and of point of view have been sufficiently reached can this unity be embodied in Church organization, whether as the expression of a common faith, the home of a common fellowship, or the instrument of a common service. Nor ought this to surprise or daunt us, for the realization of ideals is always more costly and difficult than appears at first. Were realization

less costly it would be less valuable, because less vital. *Reculer pour mieux sauter* may well be the watchword just now of the advocates of Reunion.

The prospects and progress of Reunion are dependent upon the fulfilment of the spiritual conditions. Without going back to the ultimate grounds of Christian faith and hope, it will be sufficient to set out what appear to be the essentials that lie nearest to the practical problem.

1. To begin with, it is necessary to recognize that the existing tension between Faith and Order, between Authority and Freedom, must needs continue, for the time being. Further, we must come to recognize that this tension is overruled by the Providence of our Lord for the benefit, not only of those who find a resting-place within either of these camps, but that each side—say the Roman Catholics of the one part and the Protestant Churches of the other—is benefited by the existence and activity of the other. The Roman Catholic Church, for example, benefited by the Reformation, for the counter-Reformation and the Council of Trent meant not only an improvement in the spiritual tone and the practical conduct of the Church, but also a more careful definition, in spite of plentiful anathemas, of the doctrines of the Church in the light of Protestant controversies. The Protestant Churches, on the other hand, have had their fissiparous tendencies eventually checked, and their aspirations after unity fostered, by the imposing spec-

tacle of the unity of Rome. Moreover, Rome, like a mighty river, has borne down through the ages the ancient Creeds and much that is valuable of the primitive tradition, although its waters have been discolored and even contaminated by the human and secular banks through which it has flowed. This safeguarded tradition has not only brought spiritual and mental repose to those who are within its Communion, but is a preservative and steadying influence upon those outside its Communion, who need this influence to prevent their spiritual and intellectual freedom from degenerating into licence. On the other hand, the existence and exercise of this freedom has reacted, and will react more powerfully in the future, upon the Roman Church to compel or to induce it to take some account of the growth of knowledge and of humane progress in order to ensure the preservation of faith.

2. It must further be recognized that true and complete Christian unity, while implicit from the beginning, can only be attained as the result of spiritual maturity; that, as St. Paul says, the manifold ministry of the Church is "unto the building up of the body of Christ: *till we all attain* unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv:12, 13). Or, as he says elsewhere in the same Epistle, "each several building . . . *is growing* into a holy temple in the

Lord" (ii:21). Unity, therefore, in the full sense of it, is the goal rather than the starting-point.

3. Meanwhile we must learn to recognize, despite the immense difficulty, that all Christians, however sundered, belong to one another, and must study to behave to one another accordingly. This, of course, in the sense that all who "hold the head," whether they know it or not, are joined together in His one spiritual body. But also we must all come to see that no section, however imposing its appearance, venerable its descent, or Scriptural its constitution, is self-sufficient, or, in itself, watertight and complete. None, by itself, is adequate to express and realize the full content and the inexhaustible promise of Christian faith and life. All are indeed interdependent and, in separation, incomplete.

4. Hence our differences, however they may have been either caused or intensified by the spirit of heresy and schism—this spirit being shown by a false conservatism as well as by innovation—are not merely sinful, though tainted by sin. They are still more truly the marks of imperfection and immaturity all round. None "who hold the head" must be treated merely as "erring sons" (Papal Encyclical) or "wandering sheep."

5. It is necessary to lay ever greater stress upon our agreements in fundamental affirmations, to cultivate mutual appreciation, and to seek profit and enrichment from one another. There is much to admire,

much to instruct, and much to imitate in those from whom our differences are the most serious.

6. This spirit must inspire all Christians eagerly to seize and use to the full all opportunities of fellowship in prayer and work, in thought and service.

7. Obsolete differences and separations must be swept away, and must not be allowed to intrude themselves in regions where they would not naturally arise and where they are disastrous to the progress of the religion of Christ among the unevangelized peoples of the world. As to the former, the union of the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist Churches in Canada that has been recently consummated, as well as the impending union of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland and of the Methodist Churches in Great Britain, are welcome signs of the times. As to the latter, the attempts to unite the missionary Churches—other than Roman Catholic—in India and elsewhere are not only valuable in themselves, but indispensable to such a growth of indigenous and autonomous Churches in Asia and Africa as shall enable them to make their own specific contribution to Christian life and to the advancement of Christ's kingdom.

8. Finally, it is essential to Reunion that we should all come to understand, interpret, and mold Order in terms of Faith. Two questions arise at this point. In what sense is Order, as is claimed for it, part of Faith? And, if it be so in general, what Order? The

answers can only be found as conclusions drawn from the actual history of the Apostolic beginnings and of the subsequent development of the Church. Only a summary statement can be offered here of the view held by the writer of this chapter. Faith has from the first, by its very nature and needs, created and clothed itself in Order, and has taken this Order up into itself as the natural expression of its life, the sphere of its fellowship, the instrument of its work, and the means of contact with its environment. In the course of internal and external progress the original Order, though its norm is divine and, therefore, divinely natural and congenial to Faith, becomes inadequate to the growing and changing demands of Faith and Life. Whenever this takes place, the existing Order tends to become restrictive of life and external to Faith. It can then only be fixed, insisted upon, and imposed to the hindrance of the vital activity and the effective service of Faith. When this happens, a conflict necessarily arises between Faith and Order, with a view to the enlargement and reconstitution of Order in the interests of Faith.

If Faith be in charge of this reconstitution, then the latter becomes living, plastic, and organic to the Faith that molds it. Faith assimilates the Order; the Order is vitalized by Faith. If, however, the reconstitution be merely an adaptation devised to satisfy the Faith, or pacify the restlessness, of others, the consequent Order is merely artificial and is thereby thrown out-

side Faith. Should the former be happily the case, then the changes will be a living expansion and development, true, however wide their range, to the original norm and organic to Faith throughout.

This answer to the first question dictates the answer to the second. The Order that is of Faith must be a true development of the original norm, it must suffice to give practical expression to the whole of Faith, and to edify and invigorate, as well as embrace, all the faithful. It must be sufficiently flexible to combine unity with diversity, and sufficiently manifold to satisfy the many needs and serve the diverse activities of the whole body. And, lastly, it must be sufficiently vital and elastic as to stimulate and welcome the free growth and the ever-increasing power and responsibility of all who are included in it, as to make the Church the hearth and home of ever freer life, in and through its fellowship, and to give it the means of ever-increasing adaptation, molded by the Spirit of Christ, to the expanding or changing demands of its divine mission and its earthly environment.

With every advance in the fulfilment of these conditions, and only in proportion as they are realized, will the ideal of Reunion be carried forward to its eventual consummation.

CHURCH UNION IN SCOTLAND

CHURCH UNION IN SCOTLAND

By The Very Rev. Alexander Martin, M.A., D.D.
Principal of New College, Edinburgh

In one respect at least the Scottish Union movement is unique. Where shall another instance be found of a "State" Church and a "Free" Church undertaking the adjustment of their differences by consent? That formidable antithesis has of itself been found to be a fatal cause of separation; but in this case it has been both frankly faced and overcome. Without the sacrifice of anything held essential upon either side, the reconciliation and reunion of two Churches, occupying the same territory and very comparable in numbers and in power—the one in historic alliance with the State, the other long existing independently—has been practically achieved; and in the present chapter it is perhaps this feature of the situation which may most profitably be kept in view.

Here indeed, for the most part, lies the secret of our broken unity. Our divisions are notorious, and the outsider may be pardoned for often finding their significance far from obvious. No divergence in fundamental doctrine has marred the relations of Scottish Presbyterians. They have not questioned

the validity of each other's sacraments or orders, nor ever unchurched each other. The conviction of the essential kinship of the children of the Reformation has never failed Christ's Kirk in Scotland, and so far from our separations being due to a spirit of ill-considered innovation or the like, their aim has been, as Thomas Carlyle long ago observed, to exhibit in every case a yet more unimpeachable loyalty to the common prized inheritance. Whence then the singular dividedness of our Church life, leading to a condition of things which is to-day confessedly so hurtful to the cause of true religion in the land? In the main it has had its origin in just one thing, the intromission of the civil power in Church affairs and the controversies this gave rise to. Here is the clue to our so diversified ecclesiastical history; and here too is the explanation of the special character attaching to our present Union problem.

In general terms it may be stated thus: the obligation of the body politic (being itself Christian) to have a positive relation to the Christian verity and Church, and again the obligation of the Church to acknowledge and obey, over the whole area of spiritual truth and duty, her Divine King and Head alone—these twin principles have together struggled for expression all down the course of our Church's checkered history, and only now at length, after having made sad havoc of her unity for centuries, do they bid fair to find harmonious utterance in an

arrangement of their diverse claims in virtue of which "the face of Kirk" in Scotland shall show itself both national and free!

The story of the Scottish Church-and-State relation cannot be narrated here in full; a few leading incidents must suffice. It was the faith and not the Church that first received the national countenance and support—in 1560, namely, when, Parliament having desired to know what was to take the place of the Romish system now overthrown, the Scots Confession was produced and "affirmed" promptly. Seven years later the adherents of this symbol are pronounced "the only true and halie Kirk within this realm," and to them is "declared and grantit the only jurisdiction ecclesiastical" acknowledged therein. To 1592 belongs the ratification of the Church's polity or government by Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assembly—the "Charter of Presbyterian Independence," as it has been termed. Finally, these Acts are renewed and confirmed in the Revolution Settlement of 1690; and by the Treaty of Union (1707) it is declared that Parliament "does hereby establish and confirm the said true Protestant religion, and the worship, discipline and government of this Church to continue without any alteration to the people of this land in all succeeding generations." Other enactments might be recited, but they are inferential and of less consequence. Here is the solid block of legislation secur-

ing for the Church "reformed from Popery by presbyters" an integral place among the institutions of the nation's life. The Confession of 1560, it should be added, had during the Puritan ascendancy been exchanged for the Westminster standard, which every minister and licentiate was by statute required to sign.

A picturesque feature of the Scottish alliance of Church and State has been the attendance of a representative of the Sovereign at the annual sittings of the Church's Supreme Court. The Royal Commissioner, however, is not a member of the Court, nor does his presence lend authority to its proceedings. And—though this refers to earlier days—it has happened frequently that his place remained unfilled.

What, now, of the theory presupposed in this arrangement? Nothing certainly was further from the thought of those who gradually elaborated it than that they were providing for the encroachment of the temporal power within the province of the spiritual. On the contrary, the former was invoked at every stage in the interest of the Church's liberties—to be her bulwark against Pope and King—and in no Protestant community was the proper character of the Christian *ecclesia* as a purely spiritual institution belonging to the divine order, the very Body of Christ, less disfigured or obscured. Nevertheless in Scotland also, as in Reformed Christendom generally—see the Protestant confessions and working arrangements of

Church and State alike—the bonds had been drawn too close. If spiritual autonomy were indeed to be conserved, it was obviously dangerous to give to creed and polity "the strength of a law," and when in the course of her expanding life the true nature of the Church's relation to the civil power came up for definite determination, the ambiguity it had from the first concealed was once for all made plain.

This, in a nutshell, is the meaning of "the Disruption" and the founding of the Free Church eighty years ago. Lay patronage played its part, and other questions of importance were involved. But the grand issue was the broad one of "establishment": what, in the Scottish case, did that elastic term signify, and under what conditions must a Church enjoying its benefits be content to live and work hereafter? The answer ultimately given lacked nothing in decisiveness. It was in vain that the Evangelical party pled that "the very act of 'establishment' obtains the most explicit recognition for the Church of her absolute spiritual freedom." Not even the possibility of a "compact" between Church and State, binding them to respect each other's province and powers, could be entertained—"Parliament, the King, and the three estates of the realm were omnipotent, and incapable of making a compact because they could not be bound by it." Establishment by the State could only mean the act of institution by the State. In herself the Scottish Church might be a

branch of the Catholic Church reformed, and as such might retain her inherent character unimpaired. But as taken up into a special relation to the State and invested with civil status and privilege accordingly, she fell to be considered as "wholly a creation of statute." The rights and liberties of a "State" Church, in short, were State-conferred, and therefore statutorily defined and limited. Even it was laid down sweepingly that "Parliament is the temporal head of the Church, from whose Acts and from whose Acts alone it exists as a National Church, and from whom it derives all its powers."

So bald a statement, it is true, might easily mislead as to the situation in which the Church "by law established" found herself when the present Union movement was initiated twenty years ago. A good deal had happened since 1843, and in particular, through the ready concurrence of the legislature with her desires, the bounds of the Church's freedom had decade by decade grown wider. Yet restraints and inhibitions still remained, some of them irksome enough—as, for example, in the matter of doctrinal liberty; and above all, the legal position as above defined remained, a challenging offense and a fatal bar to union in the eyes of all "Free" Churchmen. The net outcome of the recent negotiations is that the position has been transformed radically, and reunion rendered feasible on terms acceptable to all.

The motives urging on the movement may be

briefly stated. For one thing, let it not be supposed that Scottish Presbyterians have ever been insensible to the claims of unity. That, whatever outward appearances may suggest, is very far from being historically true. Already on the eve of the Reformation, when the "little flock" began to "set itself in order," the expressed intention was to initiate a severance not from "the true and halie Kirk of Christ," but from "the false hirelings" who had misled the sheep; and thereafter for many generations nothing exercised the thoughts of our divines more earnestly than the endeavor to preserve an unbroken front in a troubled and distracted time. In the seventeenth century, for example, across the Border "separatism" was rife, but Samuel Rutherford and the rest would have none of it. Was Christ divided? so neither was it tolerable that the fellowship which is His Body should be. The truth is, a large and catholic conception of the Church dominates the age of our disunions also; nor was it at any time contemplated that these should last for ever. Undertaken for the most part with infinite reluctance and pain, the anticipation has always been that in due course they should be overcome—the severing obstruction having been submerged, the waters should flow together once more.

And again, the bitter needs of the religious situation in our day cried aloud for readjustment. It is not necessary to exaggerate here; the bare facts are

sufficiently serious. One-fifth or more of our Scottish manhood fallen away from all Church influence, a provision of religious ordinances (owing mainly to the redistribution of the population during the last century and the massing of it in the narrow belt between Forth and Clyde) the most wasteful and inefficient to be found anywhere—no more need be said to show what especially lends urgency to the Scottish Reunion movement. It does not follow that Churches must unite on any terms; nevertheless a situation of the sort thrusts the question of their continued separation to the front. That makeshift arrangements for common worship and service are being found necessary up and down the land is of itself a circumstance conveying a monition which can neither be mistaken nor ignored.

The solution of the problem thus briefly sketched is, in outline, simple enough. Obstacles to union of the State's creation clearly only the State could take away. Accordingly, the plan has been, *first*, that the Church of Scotland should anew set forth her constitution as a branch of the Church of Christ, in terms expressly drawn to meet the views of the sister Church as to what such a constitution must contain; *next*, that Parliament should be approached to enact the lawfulness of the adoption of this constitution, everything in the existing connection of the Church of Scotland with the State inconsistent with its provisions being expressly repealed and declared of no

effect: thereafter (the temporalities, whose enjoyment had accompanied "establishment" and formed a material part of it, having been dealt with consequentially) the Churches, now on a level footing, would be free to reconsider their relations with one another in the new situation thus created. By the Church of Scotland Acts, 1921 and 1925, the legislative portion of the program has been effectually carried through, and, unless the steps now being taken by the Churches [1] should by any chance miscarry, Reunion ought within this coming year of grace to be an accomplished fact.

To appreciate the scheme as it deserves, a careful examination in all its bearings of especially the former of these Acts [2] is necessary. A brief commentary on its main provisions may be useful.

In the Articles Declaratory whose adoption the Act has rendered "lawful," the principle of spiritual autonomy is given expression to once for all. This circumstance is cardinal, and cannot be too much insisted on. The assertion of the principle is comprehensive and complete. Of the claim to liberty for which the Church of Scotland has secured State recognition it is no more than truth to say that it is the most elaborate and absolute yet advanced by any Church in Christendom.

Thus *Article IV* secures freedom in *organization*

[1] A Basis and Plan of Union are at present (November 1928) before the Presbyteries for final acceptance or rejection.

[2] See Appendix, pages 202-203.

and action generally. Let the claim to "the right and power . . . to legislate" be noted particularly. Here is the crucial test of corporate freedom. Administration, adjudication, the framing of by-laws and such like are on another footing. But to enact laws proper is the function of a body which is essentially self-constitutive and free.

Again, *Article V* secures for the Church *doctrinal freedom,* a claim than which none surely can be more reasonable. That the civil power—Parliaments as we know them to-day—should take a hand in defining the message the Church of Christ is to offer to mankind, strikes the modern mind as, to say the least, a grave anachronism. If for the future Christian States conform to the Christian ethic they will do well—Christian doctrine lies beyond their province. And as regards the Scottish Church the State has definitively acknowledged this.

Nor is it the case, as has been alleged, that the freedom thus secured is really limited by *Article I,* to which the powers reserved for the modification of the Articles themselves (see *Article VIII*) do not extend, and adherence to which, *as interpreted by the Church,* is essential to her continuity. The Article in question is not, properly speaking, credal: it appears to be so only inasmuch as in any general description of the Church of Christ—of which, in the Article, the Church of Scotland assumes to be a "part"—a doc-

trinal element is necessarily involved. On the other hand, pitch the claim for freedom as high as you please, it cannot be altogether unlimited. There is no such thing as an absolute or abstract liberty. A Church, to deserve the name, must have a character embodied in her constitution—even in order to hold property under public law this is unavoidable. And, carefully examined, these Articles reveal that the Church of Scotland's doctrinal liberty is unrestricted within the range of Evangelical Trinitarianism, beyond which it would be contrary to the Scottish Reformed tradition to profess either the power or the desire to go.

Once more, in *Article VII* is asserted the power to unite with other Churches. Last century saw in Scotland a notable series of reunion movements, whose outcome was the rallying to the common flag of all the more considerable sections of the national Church which had at one time or another broken with the State. But within the State Church there have been no such happy incidents. Its constitutional framework was too rigid to allow of such expansion. Individuals it could absorb. But Churches as such it could not receive; nor could it be received by them. But this disability also now gives place: the Church regains the power to "unite with other Churches on terms which [it] finds to be consistent with" the constitution it has itself framed and adopted. Con-

sidered well, what better proof to show that the Church of these Declaratory Articles is one which in every way is autonomous and free?

It will be evident, then, how far-reaching is the transformation thus accomplished. Like every living and growing institution the Church of Scotland has, as she came up through the years, acquired fresh powers from time to time, enabling her to function still more fruitfully in changing circumstances as they emerged. But how? Not solely through the free unfolding of new capacities within. Always, owing to her State connection and the necessary assent of Parliament to the adjustment called for, it could be represented that the new faculty put forth was State-derived, State-given; she was exercising, under permission, rights and powers conferred. To take just one illustration. The right restored to the people, under the Abolition of Patronage Act of fifty years ago, was not, it appeared, a purely spiritual right and privilege. It was of "civil" character, "like every other conferred by Parliament," and could be legally defined [1] as "a franchise created by Statute," "a civil right created by Statute and by nothing else." This is more than a manner of speech that grates upon the feelings of persons indoctrinated in the belief that it "pertains to the Christian people to call their ain pastors." It is a mixing of things that differ gravely. And it is well that it should cease.

[1] In law-court proceedings a few years later.

For under the new conditions all such incongruities disappear. Full spiritual autonomy ensures it. A self-constitutive, self-organizing, self-evolving body owes nothing in the expansion of its life to any external source or authority. It is "wholly the creation" of its own proper nature. The powers it exercises are not "derived" but inherent powers, its characteristics are found within. Or, to put it otherwise, the freedom and the spirituality of the Church of Christ—unhindered freedom and unadulterated spirituality—go together. In truth, they are different aspects of the same thing. And to acquire one is to acquire and safeguard both.

How, then, shall we define the resultant relation of the Church of Scotland to the State? In the heart of that relation there has been planted the large and explosive principle of unfettered spiritual freedom. In virtue of this the Church, acknowledged once for all to possess plenary spiritual authority, emerges from the position of civil institution and restraint, and confronts the State henceforward as a body self-constituted, self-expanding, self-adjusting, free. With that, every shred of civil character attaching whether to the Church as a whole or to any of its attributes or functions, shrivels away; and legal privilege, its necessary consequence, is gone. What remains? There remains, to say the least in an innocuous form, the *national recognition of religion.* And, this secured along with Church autonomy, the

old entanglement of our ecclesiastical history is at an end.

The truth is, the relation of Church and State in Scotland now attained resolves the contradictions of an earlier time. With its realization the antithesis [1] referred to at the outset is overcome. In Scotland there will, as remarked already, henceforth be a Church both "national" and "free." The solution is a novel one, and it is not surprising that it should not have everywhere had justice done to it. The fusion of these attributes, be it observed, has been effected, not by way of compromise on the part of the negotiating Communions, still less of surrender; rather has an adjustment been effected through which each stands to gain. That the future Church will be free from every taint of Erastianism need not be urged again. If additional evidence be desired, it will be found in the final provision (see *Article VIII*), by which, under its new constitution, the Church makes good its claim to power over this constitution itself; asserts, that is, the full right of a self-creative, self-evolving body, limited only by that necessity of continuing to be itself which is no limitation at all.

But further, through the recognition now extended to her, the freedom of the Church is protected publicly, as for the State's own sake and in order to the manifestation of its Christian character it ought to

[1] "State Church *or* Established Church *or* National Church is the recognized antithesis to Free Church" (T. Bennett, LL.D., in *Free Churches and the State*, p. 3).

be. So groundless is the suggestion that, because embodied in an Act of Parliament, the constitution of this Church is "statutory" and therefore fixed. Were the constitution in question a rigid one, this might be so. Whereas it is elastic, self-expanding—what is fixed by the Act is liberty!

On the other hand, the "national" quality or characteristic of the Church has been purged of those legal implications in virtue of which the latter could be described as a "branch of the [civil] institutions of the country," a "creature of the State," and the like, while nevertheless it still retains all that substantial connotation for which men really prize it. In this sense, the uniting Churches share in the high attribute equally. Do not both alike derive from a common root running far back into the past? Are not both operative and influential throughout the whole extent of Scottish life to-day? Conjoin them, and the result must be a Church more truly "national" than either. Representative of the religion of the Scottish people, and gathering up into itself all the main streams of tradition, tendency, and sentiment of earlier times, it will be eminently deserving of the title. And it will approve itself worthy to be so termed just in proportion as it fulfils the obligation, laid upon it not by the State—to the State it is no longer under any contract at all—but by Him Who has assigned it such a place in history and set before it a task so great, to penetrate the national life throughout with the Chris-

tian righteousness, and to bring the ministrations of the Gospel to all sections of the people in every corner of the land.

The problem of Church and State, as it presents itself in the Christian world, is a various one, and is destined doubtless to be solved in diverse ways. The significance of the solution indicated here will escape no student of history. It is not too much perhaps to describe it as unique. In any case, it satisfies the convictions of the conferring Churches. Unless they grievously misunderstand the heritage entrusted to them, the eirenicon devised conserves and for the first time gives full and fit expression to the whole burden of the faith and hope and purpose of the Scottish Reformation. And at this hour long-severed brethren, deferring now to no authority but that of the Church's Lord, are thankfully striving to readjust their relations to each other and their common service of His Kingdom, as His will shall be made plain to them and strength and courage given to obey.

Note

In the space assigned, it has not been possible to deal with the temporalities side of our Scottish Union question. The effect, however, of the Church of Scotland (Property and Endowments) Act, 1925, has been, it may be noted, to exchange the sixteenth-century fluctuating teind upon the fruits of the land for

a fixed charge upon the land itself; provide for the redemption of small teinds (under twenty shillings) and remit the smallest of all (under one shilling); vest all endowments in the hands of trustees under the control of the General Assembly; transfer churches and manses from the heritors hitherto under obligation to supply and upkeep these, to the Church as its absolute property; and to provide for the redemption of certain annual sums, amounting to £20,000 or thereby, disbursed by the Consolidated Fund for a century or more towards the maintenance of charges chiefly in poorer localities in the Highlands. The magnanimity of the Church of Scotland (whose main concern was that funds devoted for so many centuries to religious uses should not be secularized) in leaving the matter finally in the hands of Parliament ought not to go unrecorded. The stipulation of the United Free Church, that the resources of the Church should henceforward be under her own control, has been fully satisfied. In the event, the Church of Scotland has lost perhaps one-sixth of its annual revenues. In circumstances very different, as the outcome not of an amicable negotiation but of a protracted political controversy, the Church in Wales, one is given to understand, was denuded of about one-fifth.

APPENDIX

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND ACT, 1921

AN ACT to declare the lawfulness of certain Articles declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual prepared with the authority of the General Assembly of the Church.

[28th July 1921.]

WHEREAS certain articles declaratory of the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual have been prepared with the authority of the General Assembly of the Church, with a view to facilitate the union of other Churches with the Church of Scotland, which articles are set out in the Schedule to this Act, and together with any modifications of the said articles or additions thereto made in accordance therewith are hereinafter in this Act referred to as "the Declaratory Articles":

And whereas it is expedient that any doubts as to the lawfulness of the Declaratory Articles should be removed:

Be it therefore enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:—

1. *Effect of Declaratory Articles.*—The Declaratory Articles are lawful articles, and the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual is as therein set forth, and no limitation of the liberty, rights, and powers in matters spiritual therein set forth shall be derived from any statute or law affecting the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual at present in force, it being hereby declared that in all questions of construction the Declaratory

Articles shall prevail, and that all such statutes and laws shall be construed in conformity therewith and in subordination thereto, and all such statutes and laws in so far as they are inconsistent with the Declaratory Articles are hereby repealed and declared to be of no effect.

2. *Other Churches not to be Prejudiced.*—Nothing contained in this Act or in any other Act affecting the Church of Scotland shall prejudice the recognition of any other Church in Scotland as a Christian Church protected by law in the exercise of its spiritual functions.

3. *Jurisdiction of Civil Courts.*—Subject to the recognition of the matters dealt with in the Declaratory Articles as matters spiritual, nothing in this Act contained shall affect or prejudice the jurisdiction of the civil courts in relation to any matter of a civil nature.

4. *Citations and Commencement.*—This Act may be cited as the Church of Scotland Act, 1921, and shall come into operation on such date as His Majesty may fix by Order in Council after the Declaratory Articles shall have been adopted by an Act of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland with the consent of a majority of the Presbyteries of the Church.

SCHEDULE

Articles Declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in Matters Spiritual

I. The Church of Scotland is part of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church; worshiping one God, Almighty, all-wise, and all-loving, in the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; adoring the Father, infinite in Majesty, of whom are all things; confessing our Lord Jesus Christ,

the Eternal Son, made very man for our salvation; glorying in His Cross and Resurrection, and owning obedience to Him as the Head over all things to His Church; trusting in the promised renewal and guidance of the Holy Spirit; proclaiming the forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God through faith in Christ, and the gift of Eternal Life; and laboring for the advancement of the Kingdom of God throughout the world. The Church of Scotland adheres to the Scottish Reformation; receives the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as its supreme rule of faith and life; and avows the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic Faith founded thereupon.

II. The principal subordinate standard of the Church of Scotland is the Westminster Confession of Faith approved by the General Assembly of 1647, containing the sum and substance of the Faith of the Reformed Church. Its government is Presbyterian, and is exercised through Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies. Its system and principles of worship, orders, and discipline are in accordance with "The Directory for the Public Worship of God," "The Form of Presbyterial Church Government," and "The Form of Process," as these have been or may hereafter be interpreted or modified by Acts of the General Assembly or by consuetude.

III. This Church is in historical continuity with the Church of Scotland which was reformed in 1560, whose liberties were ratified in 1592, and for whose security provision was made in the Treaty of Union of 1707. The continuity and identity of the Church of Scotland are not prejudiced by the adoption of these Articles. As a national Church representative of the Christian Faith of the Scottish people it acknowledges its distinctive call and

duty to bring the ordinances of religion to the people in every parish of Scotland through a territorial ministry.

IV. This Church, as part of the Universal Church wherein the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed a government in the hands of Church office-bearers, receives from Him, its Divine King and Head, and from Him alone, the right and power subject to no civil authority to legislate, and to adjudicate finally, in all matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the Church, including the right to determine all questions concerning membership and office in the Church, the constitution and membership of its Courts, and the mode of election of its office-bearers, and to define the boundaries of the spheres of labor of its ministers and other office-bearers. Recognition by civil authority of the separate and independent government and jurisdiction of this Church in matters spiritual, in whatever manner such recognition be expressed, does not in any way affect the character of this government and jurisdiction as derived from the Divine Head of the Church alone, or give to the civil authority any right of interference with the proceedings or judgments of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction.

V. This Church has the inherent right, free from interference by civil authority, but under the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to frame or adopt its subordinate standards, to declare the sense in which it understands its Confession of Faith, to modify the forms of expression therein, or to formulate other doctrinal statements, and to define the relation thereto of its office-bearers and members, but always in agreement with the Word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith contained in the said Confession, of which agreement the Church shall be

sole judge, and with due regard to liberty of opinion in points which do not enter into the substance of the Faith.

VI. This Church acknowledges the divine appointment and authority of the civil magistrate within his own sphere, and maintains its historic testimony to the duty of the nation acting in its corporate capacity to render homage to God, to acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ to be King over the nations, to obey His laws, to reverence His ordinances, to honour His Church, and to promote in all appropriate ways the Kingdom of God. The Church and the State owe mutual duties to each other, and acting within their respective spheres may signally promote each other's welfare. The Church and the State have the right to determine each for itself all questions concerning the extent and the continuance of their mutual relations in the discharge of these duties and the obligations arising therefrom.

VII. The Church of Scotland, believing it to be the will of Christ that His disciples should be all one in the Father and in Him, that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him, recognizes the obligation to seek and promote union with other Churches in which it finds the Word to be purely preached, the sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance, and discipline rightly exercised; and it has the right to unite with any such Church without loss of its identity on terms which this Church finds to be consistent with these Articles.

VIII. The Church has the right to interpret these Articles, and, subject to the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to modify or add to them; but always consistently with the provisions of the first Article hereof, adherence to which, as interpreted by the Church, is essential to its continuity and corporate life. Any proposal for a modification of or

addition to these Articles which may be approved of by the General Assembly shall, before it can be enacted by the Assembly, be transmitted by way of overture to Presbyteries in at least two immediately successive years. If the overture shall receive the approval, with or without suggested amendment, of two-thirds of the whole of the Presbyteries of the Church, the Assembly may revise the overture in the light of any suggestions by the Presbyteries, and may transmit the overture when so revised to Presbyteries for their consent. If the overture as transmitted in its final form shall receive the consent of not less than two-thirds of the whole of the Presbyteries of the Church, the General Assembly may, if it deems it expedient, modify or add to these Articles in terms of the said overture. But if the overture as transmitted in its final form shall not receive the requisite consent, the same or a similar proposal shall not be again transmitted for the consent of Presbyteries until an interval of five years after the failure to obtain the requisite consent has been reported to the General Assembly.

IX. Subject to the provisions of the foregoing Articles and the powers of amendment therein contained, the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual is hereby anew ratified and confirmed by the Church.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES AND ITS RELATION TO THE MOVEMENT FOR CHRISTIAN REUNION

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES AND ITS RELATION TO THE MOVEMENT FOR CHRISTIAN REUNION

By The Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.
Bishop of New York

The most striking religious development of the present time is the growth of the desire for Christian Reunion. There has been a great change of feeling in this matter in the past thirty years. Scarcely anyone to-day will defend the divisions among Christians. The old arguments, common enough twenty years ago, in behalf of sectarianism and of "competition in religion" are now seldom heard. Whatever excuse or necessity there may have been for them, we recognize that our divisions are a disaster to the cause of Christ.

In all parts of the Christian world the sentiment for Christian Reunion has been growing, and nowhere, perhaps, has its growth been more marked than in the United States. This is not surprising, for in our land the principle of division has been carried to its fullest expression, and its consequences are most plainly seen. We have now in the United States

more than two hundred different Christian denominations. The picture presented by these differing and rival agencies is not one that is likely to draw men towards religion. If the Churches are unable to agree among themselves as to the essential truths of the Gospel, what wonder if men infer that all matters of belief are unimportant? If Christ cannot bring His own disciples together in visible fellowship and brotherhood, how can we expect men to believe in His divine power?

In our American life the practical effects of the divisions among Christians are evident enough. Our census returns show that in a population of 110 millions not more than 45 millions acknowledge connection with any Church or religious organization. It is the divisions among Christians which are responsible for the absence of religion from our whole system of public education, so that the boys and girls of our land see education carefully provided by the State, but with religion excluded, and great numbers of them grow up without religious teaching of any sort. To the divisions among Christians can be traced, in large part, that loss of definite religious influence from our homes which is the underlying, and the chief, cause of the shocking increase of divorce among us, and of disregard for those sacred ties of marriage and the family upon which Christian civilization rests. It is our divisions which prevent the Church from having its true part in the present move-

ments for social advance, and for a more Christian social order. How can the Church bring the spirit of fellowship into industry, into community life, into domestic and international relationships, if the spirit of fellowship is not manifested in the life of the Church itself?

In every one of the various Churches the effect of our present disunity is deeply felt. The faith of the whole body of Christians is weakened and lowered by it. Many who were brought up in the different Churches are adrift without any clear Christian belief. Many whose parents were earnest Christians are to be found in the ranks of the half-believing or the indifferent. Against the sin and evil that is in human life, against the anti-Christian influences at work in the intellectual world, against the unashamed paganism now manifest in much of our literature, against the present world-wide concerted attack on the whole Christian ideal of morality, of sexual purity, and of marriage, we need the power of a united Christian testimony. Sincere Christians of all names are being driven to see not only the practical disadvantages, the waste and the loss, but also the sin of our divisions, and to realize that they are a discredit to religion, the greatest of all hindrances to the cause of Christ, to the witness and work of His Church, and to the advancement of His Kingdom.

Now, what is the relation of the Episcopal Church to the religious life of the United States, and what

is the part that it may be expected to play in the movement towards Reunion?

It is a fact generally recognized that while the Episcopal Church is largely exceeded in numbers by the Roman Catholic Church, and by three or four of the Protestant Churches, it holds a place and exercises an influence quite out of proportion to its numerical strength. There are a number of reasons for this. It is due in part to the relation held by the Episcopal Church to the life of our country in its beginnings. It was the first Christian Communion permanently established in the American colonies. In 1607, thirteen years before the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth, Captain Smith and the Reverend Robert Hunt planted the Church of England at Jamestown, Virginia. Representative members of the Episcopal Church played a very large part not only in the early colonial life of our country, but in the establishment of our Republic.

A factor in this connection which should be more fully recognized is the generally high character and qualifications, and the spiritual power, of the missionaries who were sent over by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel to establish the Church in the New World and to carry its ministrations to the colonists. Not enough has been said or written of these pioneers of the faith. In those early days, along with their spiritual ministrations, they set up a standard

of learning and of culture the influence of which in the life of the Episcopal Church is felt to this day.

It has been said with truth that, "aside from its doctrinal and ecclesiastical claims, . . . Episcopacy has been a cultural influence of the highest value in the New World." Evidence of the Church's influence is seen in the fact that so many of the leaders in the Revolutionary period, George Washington among them, came from her membership. Of the fifty-six signers of the Declaration of Independence there were thirty-four from the Episcopal Church, twelve Congregationalists, five Presbyterians, two Quakers, two Baptists, and one Roman Catholic. In Old St. Paul's Chapel, New York, still standing on Broadway, George Washington, accompanied by both Houses of Congress, attended the religious service which completed the ceremonies of his inauguration as first President of the United States, the service being conducted by Samuel Provoost, Rector of Trinity Church and first Bishop of New York.

That close relation with the Church of England which in the earlier days had been the strength of the Episcopal Church became later, however, a great barrier to her progress, for in the years following the Revolution popular feeling ran high against all things British, and in the communities influenced by Puritanism there was deep prejudice against Episcopacy. For decades this prejudice, together with the long

delay in securing Bishops from which she suffered, tended strongly to retard the Church's growth, but that situation now happily belongs to the past. In this day the fact that the Episcopal Church, while completely independent and self-governing, is a part of the Anglican Communion adds much to her strength, and the definiteness of her doctrinal standards, her steadfast witness to the divine truth of the Gospel, her appeal alike to history, to reason, and to Scripture, in common with the Churches of the Anglican Communion throughout the world, give a weight to her testimony and to her spiritual influence which has been generously acknowledged by leaders of other Communions. In spite of the fact that the vast tide of European immigration brought her very few accessions, the Episcopal Church has to-day great strength in some parts of our country, as for example in New York, and since her recovery from the trying period following the Revolution she has made large growth in the country as a whole.

The deep interest of the Episcopal Church in the cause of Reunion is well known and has been shown in many ways. From the time of the noble and moving appeal of Muhlenberg, in 1853, she has furnished prophets and leaders in this cause whose influence has been widely felt. It was the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church which first put forth that epoch-making declaration which two years later, in 1888, was adopted, with slight modifications, by

the Lambeth Conference and has since been known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral. It was the Episcopal Church, at the meeting of its General Convention, in 1910, which initiated the movement for a World Conference on Faith and Order, resulting in the Conference held at Lausanne in 1927, a gathering the full effect of which cannot yet be estimated, but which marked a step forward and has given new impetus to the movement for unity. No one who knows the Episcopal Church can be in doubt as to the deep interest of her clergy and laity in the subject of Reunion. It was my privilege at the General Convention to present the resolution proposing the World Conference on Faith and Order, and, after brief discussion, that resolution was adopted unanimously and by a rising vote, an instance of complete agreement not often seen in that representative and comprehensive assembly.

If, however, we are to form a true estimate of the position of the Episcopal Church and of her relation to the movement towards unity, the following facts must be kept clearly in view:

(1) Like the Church of England and the whole of the Angelican Communion, the Episcopal Church is fundamentally and essentially Catholic in her faith and teaching. She holds that the Faith and Order of the Church are from Christ Himself, directly or through the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Church is not a humanly organized society, a

voluntary association of believers. It is a divine society, created and commissioned by Jesus Christ.

Our Lord Himself founded the Church visibly here on earth; chose and commissioned its first ministers; instituted its visible ceremonies, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, to be continued for ever; promised to be with His Church "alway, even unto the end of the world." The Church is the Body of the Risen, Ascended, and Living Christ in which He continues His life and work in this world, in which and through which He still speaks and acts, still comes to heal, and bless, and minister to us. It is not within our power to create a new Faith and Order for Christ's Church. The only basis for a true Reunion is our common acceptance of that which comes to us from Christ. We are called upon not to create the unity of the Church, but to cease from obstructing and obscuring it, to manifest visibly our fellowship in Christ.

Baptized into Christ, all Christians are members of the Church which is His Body. We cannot create a new Church in which Christians may become united; we are to restore the broken unity of the one, holy, Catholic Church created by Christ Himself in which already we are inwardly and spiritually one. It is a mistake for anyone to suppose that this fundamentally Catholic position is held only by a party in the Episcopal Church; it is the position of the Church herself, as shown clearly in her worship, in

her formularies, and in all her official acts and pronouncements. When the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church issued the Declaration on Reunion now known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral, they based it upon, and accompanied it with, the following statement:

"We do hereby affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired . . . can be restored only by the return of all Christian Communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence; which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise, or surrender, by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men."

And this position is not one in which the Episcopal Church stands alone, or makes any special claim for herself. It is a fact which our Protestant brethren need more fully to recognize, and take into account, that this belief as to the Faith and Order of Christ's Church is held not only by the Churches of the Anglican Communion, but by all the Catholic Churches of the world, both East and West, representing seven-tenths of the whole of Christendom. It is her Catholic position which gives the Episcopal Church such close relationship with the ancient Catholic Churches of the East, now largely represented in our land.

And it must be remembered that many of the Protestant Churches still hold in part to this Catholic position, as was strikingly shown by the discussions, and by the reports agreed upon, at Lausanne.

(2) While the Episcopal Church is fundamentally and essentially Catholic, she is also truly Protestant in the original and historic meaning of that word, not as opposing that which is Catholic but as witnessing for the Catholic Faith and against mediæval or modern departures from it. She stands for the historic Orders and the Sacraments on the one hand and for the open Bible on the other. It is an interesting fact that in the early days of the Episcopal Church groups meeting in Maryland and elsewhere described themselves as "Protestant Catholics," a more accurately descriptive title than the one which the Church now bears. The Anglican Churches stand firmly for the essential principles for which Protestantism has borne its witness, individual responsibility, the right and duty of private judgment, the rights of reason and the supreme authority of truth, the necessity of personal spiritual experience, the free access of each human soul to God. The great spiritual truths which Protestantism has emphasized and vindicated will never be lost or obscured, but it is coming more and more to be realized that the principle which Catholicism emphasizes are not contradictory, but balancing and complementary. Each principle is liable to exaggeration and undue emphasis, and each has in

fact been exaggerated and unduly emphasized. Each principle needs the other to correct and supplement it.

We are coming to see that the divisions among Christians which have lasted for centuries, and which have worked such harm to the cause of Christ, were caused more by human passion and prejudice, by controversial bitterness, by intolerance and lack of charity on both sides, than by any irreconcilable differences between the opposed positions. Authority and liberty, corporate life and individual freedom, sacramental grace and personal spiritual experience, the divine mission of the Church and the free approach of each soul to its Creator, why should these be regarded as contradictory or mutually exclusive? It is not that one of these principles is true and the other false, but that both are true, both represent vital elements of the Gospel, both are needed for the full life and power of the Church of God. The Church has suffered because these mutually corrective and supplementary elements have been dwelling apart instead of dwelling together. As Dr. DuBose wrote:

"We may say of sects in Christianity that their evil is expressed in the word itself; they are organized and isolated differences and diversities. Their partial and emphasized good is withdrawn from communication to, and influence upon, others; their deficiencies, ignorances, or errors are removed from supplementing, or correction, by others. They are destructive of that Oneness in Christ

which is the essence and definition of Christianity, which is ours in spite of our differences, and within which our differences would quickly melt down into not merely pardonable or permissible but even contributory and completive diversities."

In the Episcopal Church and the other Anglican Churches the Catholic principle and the Protestant principle both have place, and those who represent these two principles live, and work, and worship together. This inclusive position has its difficulties, but they are not so great as they sometimes appear to those who look at them from outside, and they are the same difficulties that we must be prepared to meet in the reunited Church. The weakness of Anglicanism has not been that it included both the Catholic and Protestant principles, but that it has not carried this principle of inclusion far enough. We need to carry out the principle more fully in both the Catholic and Protestant directions. Unity does not mean uniformity. God has created men with widely different temperaments, gifts, and spiritual capacities. These gifts are not to be repressed; they are to be developed and expressed in fellowship with Christ. There must be uniformity in those things which are essential to Christian belief and life, but beyond this there must be room in the Church for great freedom and diversity. The Anglican Churches have pushed the principle of uniformity in worship too far. Standing on the firm ground of Catholic Faith and Order,

preserving the dignity, and the common observance, of our services of sacramental character, we should make full place for all forms of devotion that are in accord with Christian principles: experience meetings, prayer meetings, gatherings for silence before God such as are held by the Quakers, revivals, missions, Salvation Army services, retreats, meditations, and every form of spiritual expression that is reverent, helpful, and congruous with the Gospel.

In the Episcopal Church we are moving in this direction. The spirit of partizan controversy has noticeably lessened among us, there is far greater tolerance in matters of ritual and worship, we are seeing more clearly the meaning of our Catholic-Protestant heritage and realizing that the Church needs for her full life the expression of both these principles, though we still have some manifestations of the old spirit which regarded the Catholic and Protestant elements in our Communion as in necessary conflict, and imagined that one of these was to be overcome and driven out by the other.

(3) The ideal of unity which the Episcopal Church holds, and has always before her, is the union of the whole Christian Church throughout the world. She holds that this alone is in full accord with the mind and will of Christ, and she believes that it is this great aim which the Anglican Churches are especially called to serve. By this ultimate ideal, this only full and sufficient goal, all her efforts in behalf of unity must

be guided. She may not, for the sake of some apparent present advance, take any action which is out of accord with this ultimate ideal or which would lessen her power to aid its realization. This is the reason that her course is sometimes misunderstood by those who look at the question of Reunion only from the narrower and solely Protestant point of view. It is for this reason that while maintaining a relation of close and brotherly coöperation with the Protestant Federation of Churches, the Episcopal Church has declined to enter into full membership in the Federation and thus identify herself with its platform. Its platform is one upon which the Protestant Churches can rightly and consistently stand, but for the Episcopal Church the platform is not large enough. It represents only the Protestant view of the Church of Christ and leaves out of account the Catholic view which is held by the great majority of Christendom. For the Protestant Churches to stand together on this platform is a step towards the goal of world-wide Reunion, but for the Episcopal Church it would be a step in the opposite direction. Many of the present proposals for unity look only towards a united Protestantism. The Episcopal Church has a wider platform and a greater vision before her.

Some of the wisest leaders of Protestantism in the United States recognize and appreciate this, though it is not to be expected that all should do so. In one

form or another the Episcopal Church is often asked a question which, put in plain terms, means this: If you are sincerely interested in unity, why do you not, for the sake of it, lay aside that which is the chief cause of difference between you and your Protestant brethren and accept the Congregationalist or Presbyterian view of the ministry, or at any rate take action which is consistent only with this view?

But, leaving aside all question of principle, would such action on the part of the Episcopal Church further the cause of Reunion? In the larger, world-wide view of the question, manifestly it would not. While this would bring the Episcopal Church nearer to the Protestant Churches, it would definitely separate her from the Catholic Churches, which include seven-tenths of Christendom. The world to-day is being compelled to think internationally. More than ever it would seem that the Church must take this world-wide view. Placed by Providence in a central relation to the Christian world as a whole, in close sympathy with the Catholic Churches on the one hand, and with the Protestant Churches on the other, the Anglican Churches have a unique mission to serve the whole Church of Christ, and to this mission they must be true.

Whatever we can do in aid of local and lesser reunions must gladly be done. We must realize more deeply the fact that all Christians are brothers, that we are all one in the life that is in Christ. We must

seek opportunities to emphasize this fellowship in public and in private in every way that is possible under existing conditions, but all that we do must be consistent with progress towards the true and ultimate goal. The cause of Reunion is not likely to be helped by lawless acts on the part of individuals defying the principles and rules of their own Churches. It is not in this spirit that the day of fellowship and brotherhood will be brought to pass. Acts of this sort create irritation and misunderstanding and tend rather to retard than to hasten the coming of Reunion. One of the most honored and trusted leaders of Congregationalism, Dr. Raymond Calkins, says: "A common communion before we have acquired the spirit of union, or the spiritual perception of the total truth which makes us one, can hardly hasten but may seriously retard our progress."

We are told sometimes that we have long been talking about Reunion, and that it is therefore time for us to take some action. This attitude, however, is surely not a wise one. In so great an undertaking we should not be impatient for quick results. It will not aid the cause if in our too hasty efforts to close one breach we tear others wider open. Some of the differences which separate us are trivial, but others are deep and real. We shall make progress not by refusing to see the difficulties, nor by concealing them under ambiguous phrases, but by facing, and considering, them in frank and brotherly conference. It

was this method which was followed at Lausanne with such hopeful results. In what other way can differences be correlated, or removed, except through conference?

Above all else we need to pray for a new coming of the Holy Spirit upon the Church. Reunion will come when the spirit of fellowship, which is the Spirit of God, is in all our hearts. And this spirit is growing in all the Churches. Scholars, Eastern, Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Protestant, are, with new patience and open-mindedness, studying one another's positions. Prejudices are breaking down. Misconceptions are being removed. In the light of modern knowledge some of the old difficulties wear a changed aspect. The old bitter style of controversy has disappeared. Mutual regard is taking the place of suspicion and misunderstanding. We are beginning to believe that the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer for His Church is not impossible. Thirty years ago a reunion which should include both Protestants and Roman Catholics was regarded as chimerical. To-day to many scholars and leaders this is no longer a thing incredible. It is Professor Harnack who writes:

"If one objects that at this time no one can imagine how, and under what forms, Catholicism and Protestantism can ever draw near one another, it is to be remembered that three hundred years ago no one could have conceived beforehand how Lutheranism and Calvinism could have been fused together. And yet we have to-day

the Evangelical Union, and thousands know themselves as Evangelical Christians without any suspicion of that opposition which once bade Lutherans and Calvinists contend more bitterly than Lutherans and Catholics."

"It is certainly among things conceivable—who shall say that it is not?"—wrote Dr. W. R. Huntington in 1898, "that God in His Providence may be preparing the way for a General Council of Christendom that shall be truly such." Few will say to-day that this is inconceivable. The Reunion of the whole Christian Church throughout the world is visibly drawing nearer. Lambeth, Stockholm, Lausanne, Malines, are opening the way for it. In the Roman Catholic Church, which outwardly may seem little moved, new forces are at work, as we in the United States perhaps especially feel. The prayers that are going up from all the Churches will be answered. Shall we not believe that in answer to those prayers, her own as well as ours, the new Rome shall appear, retaining, and exercising in still higher degree, her present spiritual power, harmonizing her position with Scripture and with history, and taking her true and great place in the Reunited Church?

From the human point of view the difficulties in the way are great. But what we have to realize is that Reunion is not a human enterprise. The call is from Christ Himself, and so it comes with compelling authority to all of us, Catholics and Protestants alike. And let us remember that the difficulty

of bringing men into visible fellowship in Christ is no greater now than it was when the Gospel was first preached. The reunion of the Church in the twentieth century would be no more wonderful or surprising than was the creation of the Church in the first century. That which God the Spirit was able to accomplish in the days of the Apostles He is equally able to accomplish now.

It may be long yet before this shall be brought to pass. But the clouds of human prejudice which for centuries have hidden from each other Rome and Canterbury and Constantinople and Geneva are perceptibly less dense than they were. The spiritual relationships between them are beginning more plainly to appear. The present great vision of world-fellowship, the movements for international brotherhood and world-peace, are calling with new urgency for a reunited Church. Nations and men are being drawn together as never before in history. More clearly than ever the Episcopal Church and the other Anglican Churches are called to be true to their mission, to think in world-wide terms of the question of Reunion, to make all their efforts consistent with progress towards the ultimate goal, to work faithfully and patiently for that drawing of the nations together in one family, that Reunion of the whole Church throughout the world which will be the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer "that they all may be one."

THE CHURCHES OF THE UNITED STATES

THE CHURCHES OF THE UNITED STATES

By Professor William Adams Brown, Ph.D., D.D.
Union Theological Seminary, New York

Every movement of more than passing significance has a body and soul. The Reunion movement is no exception. Studied from the outside, it appears to be concerned primarily with matters of administration and government. It aims to include in a single comprehensive organization all those Christians who are now members of separate bodies of differing polity, creed, and ritual. So studied it would find its appropriate place in any comprehensive history of constitutional law. But it is at the same time the expression of a deepening spiritual experience, an experience which is modifying in significant ways the habits and convictions of those who engage in it. The Reunion movement is not only generating a new spirit, the spirit of trust rather than of suspicion; it is developing an appropriate philosophy, a philosophy of unity in variety.

I. Federal and Organic Union

Looked at from the point of view of organization, the movement for unity has developed along two

lines corresponding roughly to the interests represented by the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work, and by the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order. One takes the existing Churches for granted and asks how without interfering with their autonomy we can bring our existing unity to expression through practical coöperation in the ministry of love. The other makes unity of organization its aim, and seeks to discover what form this organization must take in order to safeguard the convictions of the members of the bodies to be united. Those who are most interested in the first phase of the movement are ordinarily described as working for federal unity, those who are most interested in the second as having organic unity as their goal.

Yet this contrast, in spite of its familiarity, is misleading. Properly understood, federal unity is not inconsistent with organic unity, though under certain circumstances it may become so. The United States is an example of an organic unity which is at the same time federal, and the same is true of the British Commonwealth. In each case we have independent and self-governing States uniting to form a larger unit, yet reserving a territory in which they still continue to exercise sovereignty. In the case of the States, the amount of sovereignty surrendered is greater than in that of the Dominions, but in each case we have a dual authority, a unity in variety. Among the forms

which organic unity may take in the Christian Church, federal unity is not the least promising.

The real difference between those who believe in organic unity and those who do not is not in the kind of organization in which they believe, but in the significance which they attach to it. It concerns their attitude toward Christianity as a whole, their philosophy of the Christian life. There are some Christians who think of the Church as composed of a number of individuals or groups who have united to form an organization or organizations through which their common faith and purpose may find expression. There are others who think of it as a society whose members possess certain qualities and convictions which unite them to the other members of the society in a tie so indissoluble that it cannot be severed without permanent and irrevocable loss. How that society shall be organized, what particular form it shall assume, what amount of variation it shall make room for in the beliefs and practices of its constituent members, is a matter on which there may be honest difference of opinion. The one thing essential is that those who belong to it shall feel their loyalty to the whole greater than that to the parts. In other words, the fundamental difference is psychological rather than legal, a difference of attitude rather than of order.

Advocates of organic unity in turn fall into two groups. One group envisages this unity as conformity to a prescribed type. The other makes room for a

large range of variation and experiment. According to the first, Christianity had stamped upon it by its founder from its inception a certain indelible character. It consists of a certain deposit of faith, a prescribed form of worship, and a definite system of government from which no variation or departure is permissible. These have been handed down from generation to generation in unbroken succession by the clergy whom Christ has appointed to be His personal representatives. Any departure from this system is, therefore, *ipso facto* wrong, and the Reunion of Christendom can only be brought about by those who have made the departure at any point recognizing the error of their ways and returning to the true fold.

In contrast with this view there is another, which finds the essential mark of the unity of the Church in the spiritual graces which are shared by its members. While it highly values historic continuity, and this along all lines of creed, ritual, and order, it recognizes that in the unity of the body there are many members, and would make place for wide variation both of belief and of practice within the unity of the one inclusive Church.

We have, then, three different attitudes which may be taken toward the Reunion movement. One may welcome it as a means of bringing errant Christians back to the safety and control of the one true order prescribed by Christ; one may coöperate in it as a

means of making the individual Christian life more effective and enriching; one may see in it a way to combine in a single organized society the gifts and graces represented by the two great types of historic Christianity: the Catholic type with its reverence for tradition and its insistence upon authority; the Protestant type with its love of experiment and its consciousness of freedom.

II. The Attitude of the American Churches Toward Reunion

It is important to keep these distinctions in mind if we would understand the attitude of American Christians toward the Reunion movement.[1] They come to the movement with certain presuppositions and habits determined by their history as a people. The spirit of individual initiative, which was an inheritance from the early pioneering days; the assumption by the individual of full responsibility for the support and propagation of religion, which is the necessary result of the absence of an Established Church; the widely different strands which have entered into the making of the national life, with the resulting multiplication of denominations and sects; the wide geographical area over which these denominations are distributed, and the corresponding difficulty of developing any

[1] While the description which follows is, strictly speaking, applicable only to the Churches of the United States, many of the conditions referred to are found also among the Churches of Canada.

close community of thought and life,—all these influences have combined to give American Christianity a certain independence and individuality which determine the attitude taken by its representatives toward the various questions raised by the Reunion movement.

Over wide sections of the American Continent the individualistic attitude toward religion is controlling. The unit for many an American Christian is the congregation to which he belongs or at most the denomination of which he is a member. So far as he is interested in unity at all, it is for practical reasons, to avoid the scandal of over-churching and to secure effective coöperation in the missionary work of the Church. Such unity naturally takes the form of federation, either in the local community or in the nation as a whole. The type of American we have in mind sees no need of any other kind. If he were forced to choose between loyalty to his own denomination and that of the Church as a whole, he would unhesitatingly choose the former. His attitude toward Church unity is substantially that of a Southern gentleman toward the United States Government before the Civil War. He is for the Union so long as it does not interfere with the State, but in that event he retains as his most priceless possession the right of secession.

But there is another large section of American Christians, and I believe one of increasing importance,

which has seen a larger vision. Its members feel their oneness with their fellow-Christians of other names, and they desire some organization through which this unity may find appropriate expression. They desire it not simply for practical reasons of expediency, but because it will enable them to present a united front to the world. What form that unity shall take they are not greatly concerned to determine, except that it shall leave ample room for the differences of experience and conviction represented by the existing denominations, and that it shall not exclude any whose Christian character they believe their Master would recognize. Their experience both as citizens and as Christians inclines them to believe that such unity can best be obtained through an organization of federal character. But they are quite ready to consider another plan if that seems to promise better results. They find it hard, therefore, to understand the great importance which some of their Eastern and Anglican fellow-Christians attach to the Episcopate or, indeed, to any uniform order. Many of them are members of Churches which have broken with the older Churches because insistence upon such an order had limited freedom in matters of conscience, and they do not wish to surrender a freedom won at so great a price.

One reason why the question of order bulks less largely among American Christians than among their English and Continental fellow-Christians is found

in the great predominance of the Protestant as distinct from the Catholic type of Christianity. Apart from the Roman Catholic Church, which in the United States as in Europe holds aloof from any present participation in the movement for Reunion, the Catholic type as represented by the Eastern Orthodox and the Anglo-Catholic party in the Protestant Episcopal Church would account for little more than a thirtieth of the total of the non-Roman Christians. If one compares this proportion with that represented at Lausanne, one realizes how differently the problem of Reunion must present itself to the average American Christian from the way in which it presents itself to a British, a Continental, or, still more, an Orthodox Christian.

One of the most powerful motives which leads to the desire for Reunion in a country like Great Britain is lacking in American Christianity. I mean the desire for intercommunion and mutual recognition. For the great majority of American Protestants this mutual recognition already exists. The Presbyterian who moves to a community where there is no Presbyterian Church would be welcomed to the Communion by his Methodist or Congregational brothers. The same would be true of the great majority of the Lutherans and an increasing number of Baptists. Should a minister of any one of these denominations be called to the pastorate of a Church of a different Communion, there would be no question of re-

ordination. He would be asked certain questions about his attitude to the doctrines and polity of the Church which he was entering, but these would deal with matters of internal administration. They would not affect the basic question of his position as a regularly ordained and recognized Christian minister.

It is not meant, of course, that all American Christians are of this broad and Catholic type. The American Churches have their full share of convinced sectarians, men who insist that Christianity stands or falls with the supremacy of their particular type of creed or worship. But for the most part these uncompromising Christians are found within the denominations as members of a party or school of thought. In a few cases, as in that of the Southern Baptists and the Lutherans of the Missouri Synod, they are strong enough to control the policy of the denomination and have hitherto kept it from participating in any movement looking towards cooperation or unity. But with these exceptions they are a minority in each of the greater Communions, and were, therefore, not largely represented among the delegation that went to Lausanne.

III. What Lausanne Accomplished

This brief analysis will help us to understand the spirit in which the American delegates came to Lausanne and the impression which they carried home

with them. To most of them Reunion presented itself primarily as a practical problem, a means of overcoming the wastefulness and competition of our present divided Christendom and providing the machinery for carrying out the program of wider service which was formulated at Stockholm. At Lausanne they met men who approached the question from a very different angle and who were inspired by very different interests. They met Orthodox Christians, to whom Christianity was primarily a matter of worship and of order, to whom the seven Sacraments and the apostolic ministry were as integral elements of the Christian gospel as the message of salvation itself. They met representatives of continental Churches who looked with suspicion upon what seemed to them the undue attention given by the American Churches to secular affairs and who were themselves for the first time beginning to face on a large scale the question of the responsibility of Christianity to civilization as a whole. They saw a British delegation, Anglican in name, divided by deeper rifts of conviction on every essential matter than those which separated American Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, and Congregationalists. No wonder that many of them found themselves confused and needed time to make the necessary adjustment.

Even at Stockholm, the Conference which in many respects most closely parallels Lausanne, the presence

of deep-seated differences made itself felt, though in this case the practical purpose which dominated the Conference tended to obscure the extent of the difference. It then became apparent that the attitude of the representatives of the different Churches towards the practical questions which are involved in the social application of the Gospel was determined in no small measure by differing convictions as to the nature and function of the Church. For every reason, therefore, it seemed desirable that a conference should be held which would face these differences with the utmost frankness and determine the exact measure of agreement or of difference between the different Communions all along the line. This frank interchange of opinion took place at Lausanne, and for the first time we are in a position to determine with some accuracy the existing currents of opinion within the various branches of the Christian Church.

Incomparably the greatest of the results achieved at Lausanne was the strengthening of the position of that large and growing body of Christians who contend that the Church, in spite of the wide difference of belief and practice among its members, is in the deepest spiritual sense already one. Those who met at Lausanne, from the most Orthodox Eastern to the most convinced individualist, recognized that they were meeting not only fellow-Christians but in a true sense fellow-Churchmen, however mistaken and inadequate they might believe the practices of some of

those Churches to be. The ties of personal friendship and spiritual sympathy knit at Stockholm were immeasurably strengthened by what took place at Lausanne. It is not too much to say that at Lausanne the Reunion movement entered upon a new phase, a phase which is full of promise for the future.

This was due in large part to the method which was followed—a method of frank and sympathetic discussion of differences without any attempt to secure immediate commitment on points in controversy. This method, already successfully followed at Stockholm, was at Lausanne applied to the most intricate questions of Faith and Order, and produced a spirit of objectivity and detachment which was a great help in removing prejudice and promoting understanding.

As one of the delegates was leaving his hotel at Lausanne at the end of the Conference, he was accosted by an American Anglo-Catholic, a professor in one of the leading Episcopal seminaries. It would be betraying no confidence to say that this professor had come to Lausanne in great anxiety lest some truth which he regarded as vital should be imperiled. But by this time his fears had evidently been dispelled, for his face was shining.

"Do you realize," he said, "that there is just one thing we have forgotten?"

"What was that?" his friend asked in some anxiety.

"The anathemas," he answered.

There is a whole philosophy of life in that answer. Lausanne is, so far as I know, the first General Council of an Œcumenical character which did not feel it its duty to anathematize those from whom it differed, if not in word, at least in spirit. At Lausanne we came together to confer, not to legislate, and each was anxious not only to know the truth about his neighbor but to believe the best.

This does not mean that those who came to Lausanne were indifferent to truth, but that they recognized that truth is many-sided and that no man and that no Church possesses the whole. They wished, above all things, to understand what others really believed, and still more what they reverenced, in order that any further discussion of agreements and differences might be based upon facts and not upon mere opinion. This spirit, I repeat, at least on the scale in which it was manifested at Lausanne, is something new in the Christian Church. More than any other single influence it accounted for the notable progress that was made.

This progress was most apparent at two points. The first was the general acceptance by all who were present, Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox alike, of the duty of coöperating in the practical application of the Gospel. The other, even more surprising in view of the wide difference of opinion between the different bodies as to the place and authority of creeds, was the unanimous adoption of the Message, a

result reached after many hours of deliberation both in the body as a whole and in its sub-committee. If any demonstration were needed of the essential unity of Christians in this most important and difficult of all fields, that demonstration was given at Lausanne.

At one point alone did Lausanne fail to accomplish what might reasonably have been expected of it, and this was in connection with its treatment of the Sacrament.

This was not because no joint celebration of the Communion was held. The Conference has often been criticized on this score, but unjustly. It was just because the differing convictions of its members made such a joint celebration at the time impossible that the Conference was called. Were present intercommunion possible, there would have been no need of holding a Conference on Faith and Order.

The failure consisted in the fact that the discussions on the matter did not bring out clearly the main crux of the difficulty, which is that the problem of the Sacrament presents itself in two clearly distinguishable forms. One has to do with the ultimate goal, which is complete intercommunion; the other with the intermediate stage in which we find ourselves to-day, when failure to commune at certain times and in certain places where the spiritual conditions for such communion seem to be present creates a public scandal and does violence to the conscience of those who are there.

It was assumed at Lausanne, by no less representative a speaker than the present Archbishop of York, that the rule that applied to one case must apply to the other also; that because intercommunion in the full sense is the goal of the Reunion movement, it cannot be at the same time in certain specific instances a means to that goal. But this is by no means clear.

The attitude taken by the Conference to the parallel matter of Faith furnishes an illuminating commentary. Had the Faith of the Church been treated in the same manner as was followed in the case of the Sacrament, the remarkable unity reached in the statement on the Christian Message would have been impossible. In this case it was assumed that the Faith of the Church is antecedent to and independent of the Creeds, and a way was found to bring this unity to expression without waiting for the time when the Church as a whole should have adopted a uniform procedure with reference to the Creed. But the worship of the Church is not less important than its Faith, and this worship, all agree, culminates in the Sacrament. Surely it must be equally possible to bring that existing unity to expression in action without waiting for the time when all questions of Order have been satisfactorily adjusted. If, as the great majority of those who were present were prepared to admit, the Lord's Supper, in spite of the differing methods of its administration, is a genuine means

of grace to those who participate, it must be possible for those who believe this, at stated times and under proper safeguards, to commune together.

The reason why this was not done, I repeat, was the failure adequately to recognize the distinction between two forms of organization: the permanent organization to which the Reunion movement looks forward as its goal, and the intermediate organization which is already in process of formation, through which our present existing, although incomplete, union is given a provisional organ of expression.

Had there been time for an adequate discussion of Report VII, the importance of this distinction would no doubt have been pointed out and its implications analyzed. As it is, they must await the fuller discussion which will be given them when the different Churches which sent delegates to Lausanne report their attitude toward the findings. What that attitude will be it is too soon to forecast, but at least three lines suggest themselves on which immediate progress is possible.

IV. What Still Remains to be Done

The first thing to do is to perfect the existing agencies of coöperation, both on a national and an international scale. We must give the coöperative movement in each country an effective organization through which the Christian forces of each nation can

be mobilized for practical service in matters on which we are already agreed. These different national organizations should then be related to the Continuation Committee of Stockholm or some other similar body in such a way as to make it possible for the Church to function internationally at least in the field of life and work.

The form which such a permanent organization should take will vary in each country and will be determined by considerations growing out of its past history and present situation. In the United States it will mean the completion of the present federal organization both in the local and in the national field. The Federal Council, which now includes some thirty denominations, should be enlarged until it includes all the non-Roman bodies. Its function should be so defined as to made room for the differing viewpoints of those who make it up, and its administrative agencies should be made stronger and more effective, so that it can deal effectively with the vast regions of paganism in city and country which are still unreached by the Gospel.

But however far we may carry our federal organization, it is clear that it cannot of itself accomplish all that is needed. Even admitting the legitimacy of the principle of federation, it is still true that many of our existing denominations represent no independent values sufficient to justify their perpetuation and that the existence of these parallel and often com-

peting organizations makes effective common action difficult, if not impossible. The time has come, indeed it is long overdue, when denominations of similar doctrine and polity should unite, and this movement should be extended as fast as possible to include groups of related families.

Encouraging progress is already being made along this line. The recent creation of the United Church of Canada through the union of the Methodists, the Congregationalists, and the larger part of the Presbyterians, is the most notable example, but it is by no means the only one. In Scotland, the union of the separated branches of Presbyterianism seems likely to reach a happy conclusion through the union of the Established and United Free Churches. In England, negotiations have long been going on between the Wesleyan Methodists and the United Methodists for union. In the United States, the three Lutheran bodies which represent the oldest Church organizations in America have combined to form the United Lutheran Church in America, with a membership of 750,000 communicants, and other unions have been consummated or are on the way to consummation. Negotiations are at present being carried on by the Congregationalists with the Christians and the Universalists, and, in the case of the former, at least, action may be expected in the not distant future. The Northern Methodists have made overtures of

reunion to the Northern Presbyterians, and have begun an inquiry as to the possibility of similar union with the Congregationalists.

There is, however, a danger to be guarded against at this point, namely, that in uniting some branches of the Church we may divide others. This, as we know, has happened in the case of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. This reminds us of one of the most serious obstacles that the Reunion movement faces, namely, the existence within the different Communions to be united of separate schools or parties of widely differing conviction and interest. It is this division in the Anglican Church which has hitherto blocked all movements for union with the Free Churches, and similar conditions are found in more than one of the larger Christian denominations. What will it profit the cause to unite two bodies of Christians if as a result a minority of each separate from the uniting body? We shall have simply substituted three denominations for two.

It is worth considering, therefore, whether in the case of bodies where such internal division exists it would not be wise to postpone final action until there has been sufficient time for practical experiment in the way that unity would work. Suppose, for example, in a single designated area the authorized representatives of the Churches contemplating union, let us say the Methodists, the Presbyterians, and the

Congregationalists, were to agree that without prejudice to their present form of government they would *act* in this area as if they were one; that they would refuse to compete with one another in the smaller communities; and that in the larger cities where more intensive work was necessary they would pool their resources in common enterprises jointly administered. Is it not entirely possible that in ten years the effects of such an experiment would prove contagious, and the common mind, which is necessary to make any movement for organic unity successful, would be generated?

If experiment is desirable in the case of bodies of similar doctrine and polity, how much more is this necessary when we attempt to deal with difficulties that are due to inherent differences of conviction—difficulties such as meet us in the case of groups like the Anglo-Catholics or the Southern Baptists, who have a theory of the Church which, unless changed, makes the recognition of other bodies as Churches morally impossible.

Obviously, the only thing that can help us here is a change of conviction, such a change as comes from fresh insight and deepened experience, and this is possible only through continued contact in the spirit of Lausanne. When we remember how far apart we were when we met at Lausanne, and how much we have advanced in sympathy and understanding, there seems no limit to what may be pos-

sible when this process of education through contact is fairly under way. Only the contact needed is not simply the contact of word. It is not enough to define beliefs. We must share experiences, and this is possible only through common experiment.

We touch here on the crux of our difficulty, namely, that some of the bodies to be united now hold convictions which prevent them from trying the experiments which are needful in order to determine what is God's will for the Church of the future.

Take the matter of the Sacrament. This is the point at which at the present time our differences come to most acute expression. It is the matter which causes most grief to Christians and produces most scandal in the non-Christian world. If we are to make progress at all, we must find some way of dealing with this. Let us admit that at present indiscriminate intercommunion is not practicable. Some of us would go even further and admit that some of the reasons which make it impracticable are valid reasons so far as they go. But the fact that full intercommunion is not immediately practicable should not blind us to the fact that occasional intercommunion, under conditions properly safeguarded, may not only be possible and legitimate, but may prove an indispensable step toward the fuller unity to which we look forward.

The need of such free experiment has been recognized on both sides of the Atlantic. In his inter-

esting volume on the Lausanne Conference, Canon Woods, of Great Britain, draws a picture of what might happen in a single community if all the Christians in it determined to translate the unity of which they speak into effective action, and pleads that some group will be found who will have the courage to make the venture.

Still more significant is a recent editorial in *The Living Church,* an important Anglo-Catholic organ of the United States. Referring to a proposal made at Lausanne, but rejected, that as a step toward full Communion we might at least begin by holding simultaneous Communion—that is, a Communion held at the same time, though at separate altars, as parts of a common service—the writer advocates this procedure, not only as itself entirely legitimate, but as a necessary step forward, and commends to the next Continuation Committee that provision should be made for such a simultaneous Communion as part of the procedure of the Conference.

The significance of this proposal is to be found not so much in the proposal itself as in the fact that those who make it refuse to accept the existing situation as final. If the plan suggested is not the proper way to begin, some other way must be found. The one thing essential is that we should not stand still. How can we advance unless we enlarge our experience, and how can we do this unless we exchange experiences?

But this exchange, if it is to be effective, must be mutual. If Protestants ask their Anglo-Catholic friends to join them in common Communion, that they may learn by experience what is that real though spiritual presence which the Protestant finds in the Sacrament, they on their part must be willing to join with Anglo-Catholics in the discipline by which they cultivate the spirit of reverence. If the Episcopalian asks the Congregationalist to join him in prayer that God's Spirit will lead them both into the united Church, he must be willing to pray that God will make him ready to give up anything which that Spirit may show him to be an obstacle in the way, even if that obstacle should prove to be the Episcopate itself. One thing we dare not do, and that is to approach God in prayer with our own preconceived idea as to what His answer is to be.

For it is in prayer, after all, that our hope lies—not prayer in the old magical sense, as though God would do for us by miracle what our own prejudice and selfishness prevent us from doing for ourselves, but that God would open our minds and hearts to a larger view of His purpose for us and for His Church, that on the wider horizon thus opened to us we may see our way clear and be ready to go forward with humble and yet courageous heart along the path to which He points.

To sum up, there are three duties which lie imme-

diately before us: first, to act courageously upon the points on which we are now already agreed; secondly, to pray God for light upon the points on which we differ; and, thirdly, to resolve in our own hearts that by His grace we will move forward wherever He shall show that it is our duty to go.

THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA

THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA

Uniting the Congregational Churches of Canada, the Methodist Church (Canada and Newfoundland), the Presbyterian Church in Canada

By The Rev. T. Albert Moore, D.D.
Secretary

In June 1925 the United Church of Canada came into existence through the organic union of the Congregational Churches of Canada, the Methodist Church (Canada), and the Presbyterian Church in Canada. For almost a quarter of a century the chief courts of these Churches had conducted earnest union negotiations through specially appointed committees. While these negotiations were proceeding and the ministers and members of these Churches sought to know and do the will of Him Whom they at once loved and served, there was realized an ever-increasing experience of Christian fellowship, a constantly growing consciousness of the leadership of the Holy Spirit, and an unceasing development of conviction that only through organic union could they overtake their accepted responsibility in the establishment of religious privileges in the multitude of new settlements that were being organized throughout the far-flung spaces of the Dominion.

There were various outstanding forces which greatly influenced these Churches during the years of negotiation. Among these dominating influences was that spirit of fellowship, always a distinctive experience in Canadian life, which was revealed in various developments throughout the history of the Dominion. This fellowship found expression in the persistent efforts to unite the various political entities of British North America into one national organization and found ultimate success in 1867 when the separate Provinces were federated into the Dominion of Canada. The presence of this fellowship was also made manifest in the succession of unions within the various branches of the Churches which united in 1925. Beginning in 1817, there were constant unions within each denomination, until 1875, when the four sections of Presbyterianism, the result of many unions, were united under the name "the Presbyterian Church in Canada"; 1884, when the four sections of Methodism into which all its branches had been gathered were united to form "the Methodist Church"; and 1906, when the various Congregational Churches organized "the Congregational Union of Canada."

The definite conviction that the practice of the Christian religion is necessary to the stability of national life, which became more positive and vocal as union negotiations continued, was another manifest influence toward union. Canada is a nation in

the making. Profound belief existed among Christian people that "righteousness exalteth a nation," and "the nation that will not serve God shall perish." During the last two decades of the nineteenth century Canada became the Mecca of many thousand immigrants from both Anglo-Saxon and non-Anglo-Saxon lands. These strangers from many lands, too often in segregated communities, spoke their non-English languages, followed their non-Canadian habits and customs, and pursued the peculiar citizenship ideals and religious practices of the lands whence they came. Settling in the vast spaces of our prairies, along the shores of our oceans, lakes, and rivers, within the shadowy aisles of our primeval forests or contiguous to our ever-developing mining centers, the ministry and membership of the negotiating Churches were confronted with an increasingly perplexing problem in their endeavor to provide them with religious privileges.

The Boards of Home Missions of these Churches, acting independently of each other, would too often organize congregations of two or more denominations in one community, but for each such community a score or more were left without any religious ordinances. This denominational overlapping in new communities, with its consequent wastage of men and money on the one hand, and leaving similar communities destitute of gospel privileges on the other, was both undesirable and hurtful to religion. To

remedy this condition, the Churches adopted various plans of coöperation and many forms of federation. These methods, while helpful, neither solved the problems of overlapping and wastage nor satisfied the people that the situations were being adequately met. Some places were still over-churched and others left without the privileges of the Christian ministry. Besides, the congregations formed under plans of co-operation and federation, of which not less than 3,000 had been organized, were not satisfied with their more or less loose relation to the parent Churches, and very soon became most clamant and insistent in their demand for organic union and the establishment of a Church body in which they would hold actual and virile membership. Coöperation awakened expectations which it was unable to satisfy. The negotiating Churches were deeply convinced that organic union alone could meet their responsibility to establish adequate religious privileges in every community throughout the Dominion.

Another strong influence which contributed much towards Church union in Canada was the unshaken confidence among great multitudes of our ministers and people that Christ actually meant what He said in His great prayer, "That they all may be one, . . . even as We are one." They were solid in their conviction that Paul referred to the whole Church as the body of Christ when he wrote, "There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of

your calling: . . . till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." They believed that a united Church was the will of God, and that only in organic union could they successfully meet their God-given responsibility. The people did not love their own "ism" the less, but with deepest consecration to their understanding of the will of God, faithfully sought the organization of a united Church which would conserve the fundamentals in doctrine, include the highest and best polity for the government of the Church, and at the same time assure its members their liberty of worship, their freedom in government, and their largest opportunities in service. The more intense the fellowship between ministers and people both in union committees and in local congregations, the more earnest and multiplied the plans for local coöperation or federation, the more frequent and determined the endeavors to work together as Christian Churches to dominate Canadian life with the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ, the negotiating Churches became more settled in their conviction that through organic union of the Churches Canada could best achieve her highest development.

Another most forceful influence which greatly affected these Canadian Churches was the appeal and challenge from their respective mission fields in China, India, Japan, Africa, South America, and

elsewhere to organize national Churches, and to practise the principles of Christ's gospel in the lives of their people. As the missionaries achieved success in their respective fields, the native believers appealed to them concerning these serious matters. They wondered as to the Scriptural foundation for denominational divisions in the countries whence came their missionaries; they desired to form a National Church which would unite Christian people irrespective of the "isms" of their Mother Churches; and they earnestly inquired as to whether the people in the Mother Churches evidenced in their lives those principles of love and sacrifice and unselfish service set forth in the teachings of Jesus. They were not nearly so concerned about the name of a Church or its statement of creed as they were anxious for the organization of a Church indigenous to their own methods of living and ideals of national life. Their challenge to the home Churches was infinitely more concerned regarding the loyalty of their members to the teaching of Jesus promulgated in His sermons, parables, and conversations, than about the statement of articles of religion, questions of catechism, or the orthodoxy of their ministers and members. They neither undervalued articles of religion and creeds as such, nor overvalued the importance of loyalty to Christian principles in the lives of Christian people. But this appeal for freedom from the denominational bonds of Christian lands, and this

challenge in regard to the embodiment of the teaching of Jesus in the conduct and life of Christian people, constituted an unceasing influence among the ministry and membership of these Canadian Churches in behalf of helping to answer the prayer of Jesus, "That they may be one, even as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me."

The negotiations, which actually began in 1904 and continued for two decades, were not limited to the three Churches which were organically united in June 1925. Early in 1906 a friendly letter was sent to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England in Canada, and to the Presidents of the Associations of Baptist Churches in Canada, explaining the steps that had been taken by the negotiating Churches, and extending cordial invitations to their courts to send delegates, or to appoint similar committees, to participate in the discussion. In reply, the representatives of the Baptist Church set forth the distinctive principles of their Church and frankly stated that, in their opinion, it is necessary to maintain a separate organized existence to enable their Church to propagate their views throughout the world. Cordial fraternal correspondence with the representatives of the Church of England was carried on for some time, but it was subsequently decided

that the Lambeth proposals set forth the principles upon which Reunion might be considered, and no conference was held with the Joint Union Committee.

While the Joint Union Committee meetings were markedly fraternal and always expressive of the most cordial sentiment towards organic union, there was a minority of the ministers and members of the negotiating Churches which opposed the purpose of their supreme courts in persecuting the movement. To some of these opponents the proposals appeared to be merely administrative plans for the conduct of the financial business of the Church whose special object was the conservation of property or the husbanding of the givings of the people. Others claimed the movement was an ineffective effort to avert overlapping, to prevent local competitions in religious activities, or to mask the fact of actual spiritual decline by massing the people of two or more half-filled churches into one congregation. Still others expressed the fear that union would emphasize institutionalism as against the personal activities of Church members, would increase Modernism in theology as against the earnest faith and devout living of the fathers, and would exalt ritualism and liturgy as against the simple forms of worship and orders of service with which they were familiar. Some claimed that overlapping of congregations was not necessarily detrimental to the religious life of the community, and that even ecclesiastical competitions might pro-

voke Church members to engage more readily in Christian activities and to seek more earnestly the attainment of higher Christian virtues. There were still others who claimed that the prayer of our Lord would be answered by unity of spirit rather than uniformity in organization, and by coöperation in activities rather than organic union of denominations.

The strength of this opposition is revealed in the reports of the votes upon the Basis of Union which had been agreed upon by the Joint Committee in 1908, and approved, in general, but with several suggested amendments to specific clauses, by the supreme courts of the three Churches in 1909, 1910, and 1911. This Basis, revised in accordance with these suggestions, was then referred to the lower courts and to the membership, according to the constitutional procedure of each Church. Under this plan the votes were taken previous to 1914, with the following results: in the Presbyterian Church, 50 Presbyteries voted approval and 20 Presbyteries non-approval (793 votes for and 496 against); in the Methodist Church, 11 Conferences voted approval and 1 Conference non-approval (1,579 votes for and 270 votes against). The vote of the elders, office bearers, and membership in the respective Churches was as follows: in the Congregational Church the vote was on the Basis, when of 10,689 members, 2,933 voted for and 813 against. In the Presbyterian Church two questions were submitted, seeking

the attitude first toward organic union, and second toward the Basis. The vote on the first question was, of 9,657 elders, 6,245 voted for and 2,475 against; of 287,944 communicants, 106,755 voted for and 48,278 against; of adherents, 37,175 voted for and 14,174 against. The vote on the second question was, 5,104 elders voted for and 2,192 against; 77,993 communicants voted for and 27,197 against; 27,756 adherents voted for and 10,316 against. In the Methodist Church the vote concerned the Basis only. The result of the vote was, of 29,820 officials, 23,475 voted for and 3,869 against; of 293,967 members eighteen years of age and over, 150,841 voted for and 24,357 against; of 29,373 members under eighteen years of age, 17,198 voted for and 2,615 against; of adherents, 42,115 voted for and 7,234 against.

The yearly meetings of the Joint Union Committee were continued with manifest progress towards consummation. In 1914, acting upon suggestions from the negotiating Churches, the Committee finally revised the Basis in some of its statements, and the name, "the United Church of Canada," with the names of its courts, were approved. The Basis, as finally approved, contains a statement of doctrine at once positive, constructive and challenging to the faith of church members; a section on polity which provides for a thoroughly organized democracy by blending the most helpful methods of government of

the uniting churches with the rights of congregations to self-government in local affairs; and a provision for continuing the work of missions, education, evangelism, and other activities carried on by the three churches when united in one body. The special provisions which entitle congregations existing previous to union to continue the organization and practices enjoyed by them at the time of union has been greatly appreciated throughout the Church.

The Presbyterian General Assembly in 1915 approved the revised Basis of Union, and submitted it to the lower courts and membership with the following result: of 76 Presbyteries, 53 approved, 13 disapproved, 3 tied, 2 sent irrelevant returns, 1 rejected, and 4 did not reply; of pastoral charges, 1,331 approved, 494 disapproved; of elders, 7,066 approved, 3,822 disapproved; of communicants, 106,534 approved, 69,913 disapproved; of adherents, 36,942 approved, 20,004 disapproved. When this report was received, the General Assembly of 1916, by a vote of 406 for union, and 90 against, resolved: "That this General Assembly now resolves to unite with the Methodist Church and the Congregational Churches of Canada, to constitute the United Church of Canada, on the Basis of Union, approved by the General Assembly of 1915, and by the majority of Presbyteries since consulted under the Barrier Act; that a Committee be appointed to carry out the policy of the Assembly," and "report to the first

Assembly following the end of the first year after the close of the war." In 1921 the General Assembly reached the decision "to take such steps as may be deemed best to consummate Church union with the above-named Churches as expeditiously as possible." The Methodist and Congregational Churches acted in harmony with these decisions of the Presbyterian Church.

Following the close of the World War the supreme courts of the Churches resumed union negotiations. Meantime, the large number of local union Churches in Western Canada had formed "the General Council of Local Union Churches," and from 1921 representatives of this Council were welcomed to the yearly meetings of the Joint Union Committee. Draft bills for the incorporation of "the United Church of Canada" were prepared, and after careful consideration during the years 1921 to 1924 were approved. These were enacted in 1924 by the Parliament of Canada, and in 1924 to 1926 by the Legislatures of the various Provinces. The Federal United Church of Canada Act recites that the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Methodist Church, and the Congregational Churches of Canada have represented that they have the right to unite without loss of their identity, and declares that the said Churches, "by their free and independent action, through their governing bodies and in accordance with their respective constitutions," have united to form "the United

Church of Canada." Congregations were given the right to decide by majority vote not to enter the Union. Those which voted non-concurrence retained their congregational property. Provision was also made through the appointment of a Federal Commission, of which the Chief Justice of Canada was chairman, by which the Church organized by the non-concurrent Presbyterians would receive their equitable share of the general property of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The decisions of this Commission were based, almost without exception, upon agreements mutually arranged between the representatives of the United Church, and of the non-concurrent Presbyterian Churches. In certain Provinces also, Commissions were appointed for the adjustment of the claims of apparent cases of extreme hardship of minorities in relation to congregational property.

On June 10, 1925, the union of the three Churches was solemnly consummated in the city of Toronto, in the presence of almost 10,000 members of the Church. The Basis of Union was formally signed by the chief officers of the supreme courts of the uniting Churches, and the First General Council of the United Church of Canada, composed of three hundred and fifty Commissioners (the General Conference of the Methodist Church and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church each having appointed one hundred and fifty, the Congregational

Union appointed forty, and ten were appointed by the Council of Local Union Churches) was duly constituted. The Commissioners and the assembled Church members participated in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and in the service of hallowing and consummating the union, as the three streams of Christian life flowed together and formed the United Church.

The concluding words of the final Report of the Joint Union Committee are these: "We draw attention to the fact that the spirit of unity has characterized the Churches of Canada from the dawn of her history. Each of the Churches now uniting is itself a United Church. The present Union, now consummated, is but another step toward the wider union of Evangelical Churches, not only in Canada, but throughout the world." The approximate strength of the United Church at the time of union was 8,000 congregations, 600,000 members, and 3,800 ministers. The Church is organized with a General Council, 11 Conferences, 114 Presbyteries, and almost 3,000 pastoral charges.

The results of Church union in Canada are well expressed in a pamphlet, *Two Years' Progress*, issued under authority of the United Church, by its Bureau of Literature and Information of the United Church. The following paragraphs are quotations:

"Since June 1925 amalgamations have reached the startling figure of 410 Churches which have been

consolidated into just half that number, to form strong and, for the most part, self-sustaining community Churches. These are widely distributed. In British Columbia there are more than 45; in Alberta, 23; in Saskatchewan, 38; in Manitoba, 22; in London Conference, 36; in Hamilton Conference, 30; in Toronto Conference, 60; in Bay of Quinte Conference, 24; in Montreal and Ottawa Conference, 45; in the Maritimes, 87. The gain has been enormous. For one thing, the overhead expenses have been usually cut in two; the minister has had a man's job; the musical service of the Church has been greatly strengthened by a consolidation of the choirs; and in hundreds of cases the Home Mission Board has been entirely relieved of the necessity of paying two grants in a single community, where none is now needed.

"The Foreign Mission Board reports that the United Church of Canada has established relations of fellowship and service with representatives of all the major races and more important land divisions of the non-Christian world. The work formerly carried on by each of the uniting Churches supplements the rest. There is no overlapping and no unseemly rivalry among the uniting Churches in the foreign field. As a whole, the foreign mission task of the United Church of Canada constitutes a worthy heritage and offers an attractive opportunity for effective service in the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"The task of supplying Gospel ordinances to the people of Canada has taxed the resources and ingenuity of all the Churches. Happily for this country, the larger part of the population is living in the rural sections. In Western Canada, especially, the settlements are often sparse and isolated. The avowed ambition of the United Church is to claim every community in Canada for Christ, and to minister in His name to all, regardless of creed, language, or color, who need her help, and who are dependent upon her for comfort and instruction in the Gospel.

"The United Church has 4,105 preaching-places in the Home Mission areas of Canada alone—almost 48 per cent. of the worshiping units of the whole Church; 1,373 United Church ministers are engaged in this work.

"Few, if any, Protestants who come to Canada will be beyond the reach of ordinances, and the vast majority of them will find that the United Church is the only Church doing Christian work in the areas where they settle. In this nation-wide responsibility the United Church is unique. It has been possible for the Church to open 149 mission fields in new territory, in which no Protestant service had been held previously. Each of these fields has an average of almost four preaching-points. At a glance one sees that responsibility has been assumed in fully 600 communities hitherto neglected by all the Churches."

The foregoing quotations indicate something of the progress of the United Church. Time and space prevent reference to colleges and Sunday schools, to Church buildings and property increases, to young people's work and the pension plans for aged ministers, and the multitude of other enterprises of the United Church. Another paragraph says:

"A mere recital of the figures is impressive. The very massiveness of the Church's investment is challenging. But her chief assets are not in stone or money. There is evident in many parts of the United Church a distinct deepening of spiritual life. The deep religious note of the Consummation Services in 1925 still reverberates in Presbytery meetings; the hundreds of groups engaged in intensive Bible study, prayer circles in every part of the Church, effective conferences on Evangelism, the evangelistic note in the sermons of her preacher, and the manifest spiritual hunger of her people have constituted at once an opportunity and a challenge. The United Church is essentially a fellowship in Christ. Any equipment she has, any physical resources she releases in her work, are but an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual reality. In entering a larger Union, the United Church dared greatly for the Kingdom of God in Canada and the world. She was born of a spirit of great unselfishness, convinced that,

by her very name, the welfare of all must be her responsibility."

The aim of the United Church is to help Canada to be a truly Christian country and do its part in promulgating the Gospel throughout the world. Three years' experience of Church union have abundantly justified the most sanguine expectations. The personal relations between ministers and members who were accustomed to different forms of worship and different methods of Church government have been most cordial. That union has been an enriching experience in Christian fellowship and coöperation and increased the degree of Christian unity among our people is revealed by the harmony which has existed in the various Church courts and throughout our congregations since union has been effected.

The new conceptions of the widening claims of social life; our responsibilities to men, women, and children; the vital and unceasing needs of the poor, the toilers, and the under-privileged, together with the perpetual duty to preach the Gospel to every dweller in our far-flung provinces, constitute a persistent challenge to an heroic task. More and more there has been burned into our minds and hearts the consciousness, on the one hand, that sin, in the twentieth century, continues to "be earthly, sensual, and devilish," regardless of race, creed, or citizenship, and that the world in which we live is a lost world; and on the other hand, that the business of the

Church of Jesus Christ is to "preach the gospel to every creature." The experiences of the World War forced upon us with immeasurable influence the conviction that religion must become the high priest and liberator of humanity. Nothing must interfere with that Christian unity within our own country, or between our country and other lands, which would prevent that Christian fellowship between the children of God, and that Christian coöperation with the children of God in every land, which would enhance the value of worship and increase the results of working together for His glory.

Organized Christianity in this day must gather round its Lord and Redeemer, and pledge itself, not merely to fidelity to the memory of a great creed and a glorious past, but also to a new crusade to lead the world to practise the imperishable ideals of Jesus Christ at whatever cost, in order that all the people of all the nations may realize that supreme reconciling message of our Lord, "Come unto Me, all ye ends of the earth, and be saved." "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." In that highest experience of Christian co-operation may we all come into that unity of faith and knowledge of the Son of God that will produce the Christian fellowship which ever maketh increase of his body unto the edifying of itself in love.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN INDIA

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN INDIA

By The Rt. Rev. Vedenayakan Azariah, LL.D. (Cantab.)
Lord Bishop of Dornakal

The problem of Church union in India is slightly different from the same problem in Christian West. The divisions of Christendom in the West are the results of historical and political developments, or doctrinal controversies, often due to racial and temperamental differences. The union of the Churches is there looked upon by many as an abstract ideal, a laudable dream. Disunion in the mission field, on the other hand, is an offense and stumbling block to the non-Christian, a perplexity and a problem to the Christian, and a cause of wastage and inefficiency to the missionary cause. If in Christian countries disunion means feebleness and ineffectiveness to the Church, in non-Christian lands it brings shame and dishonor to the name of Christ.

The evils of disunion are not, for many reasons, so palpably manifest in the mission fields as in the West. The recognition by most missions of the principle of territorial delimitation is one of these mitigating causes. The humiliating spectacle of competing Churches has thus often been avoided.

To interdenominational agencies like the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations and the National and Provincial Christian Councils also belongs the credit of uniting the various Churches in common activities and sometimes also in common policy and common action in dealing with common problems. Face to face with many forces which operate everywhere almost identically against the progress of the Gospel, opportunities for conferences and consultations have been welcomed by most missions.

These causes, however, could not long keep the indigenous Christians in ignorance of the divisions of Christendom. The Roman Church, the oldest and by far the largest Christian body, for instance, has recognized no territorial delimitation, and has stood aloof from all conferences and councils. There are some Protestant bodies who claim to be the sole exponents of the pure Gospel of Christ, and thus have invaded the recognized spheres of other Churches and planted their own Churches in their midst—a thin end of the wedge often being the supposed necessity to follow their own people wherever they go. Moreover, the Presidency cities from the beginning had to be recognized as common ground for all Churches.

The bliss which comes by ignorance therefore could not last long. The spread of education and business drove a large number of Indian Christian

youths towards the Presidency cities, and there they came into contact with all denominations. Those in Government services were transferred from one place to another where some denomination other than their own had its church, worship, and ritual. Under these circumstances, denominational loyalty was often impossible even for devout members. For most of these laymen any Christian fellowship was preferable to fellowship with Hindus, and consequently restriction of this fellowship by ecclesiastical authority was felt to be unjustifiable interference with personal freedom and contrary to all rules of Christian charity. In any case, denominationalism sits very loose on most Indian Christian laymen. When questioned by the non-Christian observers about the significance of these differences, sheer shame compels them to minimize the differences and claim unity, where outwardly there is none. Nationalism, too, has the same effect. To whatever Churches Christians may belong, they consider themselves members of the Indian Christian community—a single political unit, with a common religious and social life and with common political ambitions. This, then, is the background against which the attitude of the Indian Christians towards unity must be viewed for right appreciation.

The Anglican Church in India is over a hundred years old. There is scarcely a portion of this large continent where this Church is not represented. Over 120 other Churches, sects, and denominations

are also working in India, and altogether the Christian community numbers about 4,500,000 Indians. Of these, Indians owing allegiance to the Anglican Communion are about 387,000—hardly a tenth of the total. These are organized under fourteen dioceses, and constitute what is called "the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon."

The movement towards union originated in South India, and rightly so. Two-thirds of the total Christians, including four-fifths of the Anglican Indian Christians, live in South India. Here, too, the Christians largely belong to the Dravidian races, and persons belonging to the different Churches are socially and linguistically one. Intermarriages between the Churches are common. The territories occupied by the different Churches are so near each other that the members often come together for conferences, conventions, and retreats. In short, the Christians are one in racial inheritance, social interdependence, and spiritual experience. The Church alone separates them. Close contact, however, leads men of each section to covet for themselves those elements that are attractive and valuable in the other.

This growing desire first found expression at an informal conference of Indian ministers held at Tranquebar, South India, in the year 1919, to discuss possibilities of Church union. Papers were presented by chosen leaders of the four larger Communions in this part of India—viz. the Anglicans, the Lutherans,

the Wesleyans, and the South India United Church —describing the characteristic feature or features of each Communion, the valuable elements in each which ought to be incorporated in a future Church of India, and the official attitude of each Church towards union with other Churches. Of the bodies that were represented, the Lutherans and the Wesleyans did not seem to favor immediate union with others. The Anglicans and the S.I.U.C., however, felt very much drawn to each other.

The South India United Church is an ecclesiastical organization formed in the year 1909 by the union of Indian congregations connected with the American and English Congregational Missions and the Scottish and the American Presbyterian Missions. Their Church membership totals about 250,000; the Anglicans in the area number about 300,000. It was quickly seen that these two Churches were really "one in hope and doctrine, and one in charity"—and the only obstacle in the way of organic union was the Ministry. If the absence of the historic Episcopate in the S.I.U.C. ministry was the only hindrance to unity, these S.I.U.C. ministers were in favor of adopting the Episcopal ministry. Moreover, it was *union* that they wanted to secure, and not *reunion.* As a matter of history, neither they nor their forefathers ever went apart to divide the Body of Christ. With this object, they issued a statement from which these words may be quoted:

"We believe that the challenge of the present hour in the period of reconstruction after the war, in the gathering together of the nations, and the present critical situation in India itself, call us to mourn our past divisions and turn to our Lord Jesus Christ to seek in Him the unity of the Body expressed in one visible Church. We face together the titanic task of the winning of India for Christ—one-fifth of the human race. Yet, confronted by such an overwhelming responsibility, we find ourselves rendered weak and relatively impotent by our unhappy divisions—divisions for which we were not responsible, and which have been, as it were, imposed upon us from without; divisions which we did not create, and which we do not desire to perpetuate."

This statement was in due course placed before the General Councils of both the Churches, and each body appointed fifteen members to constitute a Joint Committee to explore possibilities of union. Later, the Wesleyans of South India also joined in the negotiations, and their Synod appointed another fifteen members on the same Committee. This Joint Committee has had seven meetings altogether, the last three of which have been attended by delegates of all the three Churches.

The present position of the negotiations is this.

I. Unity in Doctrine

In doctrinal fundamentals there was no question of difference. It was therefore quite easy for all to agree to the statements on the Holy Scripture, the Creeds, and the two Sacraments.

(1) We are agreed, declares the Resolution, that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain all things necessary to salvation, and are the rule and ultimate standard of faith;

(2) That we accept the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed as containing a sufficient statement of the faith of the Church for a basis of fellowship;

(3) That the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, are to be ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

II. Episcopacy

The question of the Episcopate and all its various implications to secure "a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church" was one that required very careful consideration. So far, agreement has been reached along the lines indicated below:

(1) The historic Episcopate is accepted as the basis of union.

(2) All consecrations of bishops would be per-

formed by bishops, not less than three taking part in each consecration.

(3) After union, all ordinations to the presbyterate would be performed by laying on of hands of the bishops and presbyters.

(4) It is the intention and expectation of those who enter the union that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the Church will be an episcopally ordained minister.

(5) The Episcopate is to be constitutional—that is, the bishops are to be chosen by election, in which both the diocese and the province shall have an effective voice. The bishops shall perform their duties constitutionally in accordance with such customs of the Church as shall be defined in a written constitution.

(6) While the historic Episcopate and an episcopally ordained ministry are thus faithfully preserved in the United Church, no particular interpretation of the fact is to be demanded of the uniting Churches. Some may believe that Episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Church and others only of the *bene esse* of the Church; some may believe it is the only channel of ministerial grace which makes all sacraments valid, while others that it is a useful preserver of order and unity possessing very ancient authority. All of these views and others too exist within the Anglican Church at present, and it is recognized that all these views are tenable within this United Church also.

III. The Present Ministry

The next difficult problem which necessitated much anxious thought was that of the status of the existing ministers who before union had received an ordination by presbyters. The solution proposed is contained in these agreements.

(1) The existing ministers of the three Churches are to be accepted as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the Church after union. In other words, every ordained person exercising a ministry before union will, without any re-ordination, continue to exercise his ministry unhindered in the sphere to which he was ordained.

(2) There should be no such indiscriminate intermingling of the ministry in the congregations as to lead to the wounding of individual consciences or compelling any individual to accept a ministry to which that individual may object on principle.

(3) To secure this, it is agreed that no minister ordained before the union—be he an ex-Anglican or an ex-S.I.U.C. or an ex-Wesleyan—shall minister temporarily in any church or congregation without the consent of the parish minister and the congregation; nor shall he be transferred to any new congregation without the consent of the congregation and the bishop.

(4) To cause no one any injury in the matter of Holy Communion, it is also agreed that arrangements

existing at the time of union by which Anglicans in any particular place enjoyed opportunities of receiving Communion at the hands of an episcopally ordained minister will not be terminated because of the union.

Any conscientious scruple on the part of any member being thus carefully respected, it is hoped that the recognition of the past ministry without re-ordination will solve the difficulty of the transition period, and a really united ministry will eventually be the happy result.

IV. Position of New Missionaries

The next problem that demanded a solution was the position of the missionaries from the home Churches. The uniting bodies at present look to the Congregational and Presbyterian Churches of England, Scotland, and America for missionaries to occupy important positions in the ecclesiastical organization, for ministerial training, and for the work of evangelization. It is recognized that for a long time to come they will continue thus to be dependent on their Mother Churches. That being so, would the new missionaries claim to be exempted from the rule of episcopal ordination, or would they come out unordained to be locally ordained in accordance with the constitution of the Church they are to serve? We could not be sure how the Anglo-Saxon mind

would work, and it was therefore agreed that for the thirty years succeeding the union—i.e. during one generation—the ministers of any Church whose missions have founded the originally separate parts of the United Church may be received as ministers of the United Church with the same status, privileges, and limitations as those who with previous non-episcopal ordination came into the United Church at the time of union. After this period of thirty years, it is provided that the Church itself ought to consider and legislate for all such exceptions to the rule of an episcopally ordained ministry.

V. Fellowship Within and Without

Another question that has received very careful thought is the question of intercommunion within and without. What regularization, if any, is required in the conduct of individual Church members, ordained ministers, and the Churches of the United Church in the matter of ecclesiastical fellowships? The agreement reached by the Committee on this subject may be summarized as follows:

(1) Any communicant member of the United Church shall be at liberty to receive Communion in any part of the United Church.

(2) The Church itself after union will regulate and define its relations with other Churches.

(3) In the early period of union, no restriction

shall be placed on ministers or members of the United Church against continued exercise of privileges of intercommunion and intercelebration which they may have possessed before the union.

(4) The uniting Churches have enjoyed, as organized wholes, various degrees of fellowship with Churches abroad of similar ecclesiastical polity. The United Church hopes on its part to continue these relationships. For instance, it will seek to be in communion with Lambeth, and will gladly respond to invitations to take part in the Decennial Lambeth Conferences. It will likewise seek affiliation with the World Alliances and World Unions of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches—if these would permit such affiliation. Of course there is a difference between the Bishops of the United Church attending the Lambeth Conference and representatives attending the World Presbyterian Alliance. It is, however, suggested that such a formal declaration of the United Church's position should be made to signify the character of that Church after the union.

These proposals have been made by the Joint Committee and have not all been considered fully by the Council of the whole Anglican Church of India. That Council, however, was so far satisfied with the proposals placed before it at its last meeting (February 1928), that it authorized the Metropolitan to have this subject placed on the Agenda of the ensuing Lambeth Conference (1930), so that the pro-

posals might be considered by that Assembly in all their bearings.

Questions Still Pending

Should the main provisions set forth above meet with general approval, there is very little doubt but that reasonable solutions of the problems still under consideration will be found to the satisfaction of all. Some of these may be mentioned.

(1) *Confirmation.*—At one of the early meetings of the Joint Committee, Confirmation was definitely brought forward for consideration. It was, however, soon realized that the practice of Confirmation was so variant in different Episcopal Churches (as, for instance, in the Holy Orthodox Church, other Eastern Churches, and in the Church of Sweden) that the rite as practised by the Anglican Church could not be made a condition of union. But in the words of the Lambeth Subcommittee we also may express the hope that as a result of the closer intimacy which the union will bring, the United Church may consider the possibility of the restoration of the laying on of hands as an outward sign of the grace given in Confirmation.[1]

(2) *The Diaconate.*—The South India United Church has the system of lay deacons (called elders or deacons) who are chosen by the congregations to

[1] *Report of Lambeth Conference,* 1920, p. 153.

hold office for a term of years. These deacons or elders form—what Anglicans would call—the Parish Committee. They assist in the distribution of the elements at the Lord's Supper, visit the sick, and in general assist in the pastoral work of the minister. This office, however, is not communicated by ordination, nor is it lifelong. The ministerial office does not of necessity require the diaconate-probation.

In the Anglican Church, on the other hand, there has been a desire to revive the diaconate as a separate Order of substantive value in itself and not merely a probation for the priesthood. That being so, it ought to be possible for the two Churches to come to some agreement about the continuation of the diaconate as a ministerial Order in the United Church. The Anglicans will give sympathetic consideration to proposals for a conception of the duties of a deacon somewhat different from that which now exists in the English Church. By the uniting bodies adjusting their ideas of the diaconate to the New Testament ideal and present-day needs, it ought to be possible in the United Church to conserve a custom which has prevailed in the Catholic Church for more than a thousand years.[1]

(3) *The Liturgy.*—At the present time the S.I.U.C. use *extempore* prayer in their service of Holy Communion in addition to certain set forms. The Anglicans, of course, use the Liturgy in the Book of Com-

[1] *Documents on Unity*, p. 307.

mon Prayer. The Wesleyans use a service which is largely identical with the Anglican Liturgy. It is proposed that these practices should be permitted to continue after the union, and at the present stage there should only be agreement in regard to certain important parts or sections of the service. Such a list of the constituent parts of the Service of Holy Communion has been drawn up and is agreed upon. We foresee therefore no difficulty in regard to this. The Churches agree that one of the first tasks of the United Church will be the formulation of a Liturgy that will be, as far as possible, at once Scriptural, Catholic and Indian.

(4) *Relation to the Church of India.*—While the whole Anglican Church throughout India is negotiating and considering the terms of the union, it is obvious that the union becomes a practical proposition in South India only. The South India United Church is an organization confined to the Presidency of Madras and its Indian States. The Wesleyan Synod negotiating union is the Provincial Synod of South India and not any other synod in other parts of the country. The Anglican dioceses which will have to adjust their organization and boundaries to the new situation are the five dioceses in the South of India, which alone are in the area of the other negotiating Churches. The question still to be decided is whether the whole Anglican Church in India should join in the United Church or only the South India

dioceses. The writer of this article earnestly hopes that the whole Anglican Church in India will enter the union, and that there will be a United Council of some sort combining in it representatives of the uniting groups, while the dioceses in South India, together with the new dioceses that will be created because of the union, will be constituted a Southern Province having in all local matters liberty to order its life and constitution in accordance with the genius of the Dravidian race and the necessities of the Indian congregations directly affected by the union.

Here, too, arises another problem that needs careful thinking. The South India United Church at present solely consists of Indian congregations. The Presbyterian English congregations are not organic parts of that Church. The same is true of the Wesleyans. Their chaplains ministering to the British troops and the English congregations ministered to by them have no representation in the South India Wesleyan Provincial Synod. The Anglican Church in India, on the other hand, includes clergymen and members of all races residing in India, and its bishops have spiritual oversight over all clergy and Church-people living in the area of their dioceses. When the union takes place in South India, it is with delegates of all races and nationalities that the delegates of the S.I.U.C. and the Wesleyan Church will have to sit in synod or council; and it is not right that the English and the Anglo-Indian congregations now under

Presbyterian or Wesleyan oversight should be outside such an organization. The unity of all races in one Church *must* be maintained, if for no other reason, at least for this, namely, to demonstrate to India that the Church of Christ oversteps all natural barriers of race, color, and nationality, and that IN CHRIST all are one.

This catholicity would require that the Indian section of the Church should cordially secure to the English members of the United Church the unhindered use of the Liturgy and forms of prayers to which they are accustomed in their own homelands. It would mean that such congregations should be reckoned as integral units of the Church, and the spiritual needs of those congregations would be as much the responsibility of the Church as those of the Indian congregations. It would involve a loyal and spontaneous adhesion to all the provisions of the Indian Church Act and to all the agreements entered into by the Church of India with the Government in regard to Churches to maintain which they are at present making grants to that Church.

For these reasons, it is very much hoped that the whole Anglican Church in India will enter the union, and the United Church will include in it the whole body of Christians, Indian and European, at present in the three negotiating bodies and of their ecclesiastical connections.

"The Church of Christ," as the Bishop of Bombay

has well said elsewhere, "has always the duty of uniting men." India is preëminently the land of divisions; and the Church in India ought to be preeminently a force for unity. "The Church is bound to preserve any existing organization which oversteps the boundaries of race and prepares for a higher unity." Consequently, as the Bishop continues, for the Anglican Church to give up the position which at present it holds of being an all-India Church, and to base this new unity on a racial or even linguistic basis would be disastrous. Such a unity does not help India.

At the time of writing this, all these problems are under the consideration of the Joint Committee, and it is expected that a complete scheme of union will be drawn up for presentation to the Lambeth Conference of 1930, and it is confidently hoped that with the sanction and blessing of that august body the union will go forward.

When that happens, the rest of North India and Western India will not long stay outside the union. The Wesleyans and the Presbyterians cannot be in one ecclesiastical connection in the south and in a different connection in the north. The Presbyterians and Anglicans cannot be in one Church in the south and in different Churches in the north. Thus union in the south, therefore, is bound to be contagious and *it must spread.*

The only large bodies that will then be outside this

union will be the Lutheran Churches, the Baptist Churches, the Syrian Church, and the Roman Catholic Church. Let us pray that these too will fall into line in the future, so that we may truly rejoice in India over "one body, one Spirit, and one hope; one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, and one God and Father, Who is over all, through all, and in all."

A VISION OF THE REUNITED CHURCH

A VISION OF THE REUNITED CHURCH

By The Rev. W. E. Orchard, M.A., D.D.

It is surely possible for all believers in our Lord's promises and prayer concerning His Church to conceive that, at least, some day it will be visibly and indisputably one; and if so, it might be granted to some prophetically endowed soul to have a vision of that glorious actuality. It should be unnecessary to say that, while the present writer believes that Christ's prayer that "they may all be one" will yet be answered, and in some degree has been already answered, his vision of its more complete fulfilment does not claim to be what will actually happen, and therefore makes no pretense to prophetic foresight. Only something very much more commonplace is intended: namely, a vision of what conceivably might be, and therefore of something no more than a possibility. And yet the writer would have the reader treat the vision as neither unsubstantial nor a mere dream. His vision is a conscious construction, on which some thought has been spent. Such a construction may appear to some very labored, and by others may be regarded as impossible or undesirable. Nevertheless it is claimed that the vision has been built upon the existing facts, however bewildering their number and

diversity, and is inspired by the belief that these facts are actually capable of being gathered together into a real and effective unity. The vision, therefore, also embraces the process by which the one state of things may pass into the other. And there is claimed for it this value: that it gives a vision sufficiently full of hope to be worth working for, and, what is equally important, worth waiting for.

It is not claimed that the writer has discovered that all the separate, scattered, diversely shaped bodies which call themselves Churches form the pieces, as it were, of a kind of picture-puzzle, which only require rightly fitting together to form a well-designed and attractive picture. That would have to presuppose an original design, for some strange purpose allowed to be thus perversely cut up; for the task is not so simple as the mere reshuffling that would then be necessary. It is recognized that present facts, the fulfilment of the vision for the future, and the intervening rearrangement necessary, do not correspond to any such analogy.

It is to be hoped, however, that the employment of such an analogy, even if only to be rejected, may be patiently endured, for it indicates that the writer rejects the vision of a mere federation of the existing organized bodies of confessed Christians. The problem of Reunion is not to be solved merely by the adoption of mutual toleration. That idea must be rejected as inadequate, firstly, because there are large

and important bodies which would not consent to any such general toleration; and, secondly, because it is impossible to embrace such contradictory elements in a single picture. To translate the analogy closer to actual conditions, and to adopt one often employed: if the various Christian bodies are compared to the different branches of an army, then some are at present fighting one another as if they were bitterest enemies, and others are only at peace with one another because they never meet. To win the war of the Church against the world it is widely recognized that there must be a united front and something equivalent to unity of command. Who shall command then becomes the difficulty. There is one voice that does speak with commanding tones; it is heard in this volume; but millions refuse to admit its right or obey its voice.

There is another vision which we ought to consider and show reason why we reject. It may be described under two analogies: one, which envisages the strife between Christian bodies as a conflict which will have to be carried on until one survives as the conqueror of all the rest. There are many who seem content to believe that these various bodies are only going through a process of sorting out, until at last Protestant and Catholic will confront one another without further sub-division, and then apparently will come the Armageddon of the Churches. Apart from the fact that there are diverse prophecies as to

which will even then prove the victor, and envisaging the miserable strife that such an issue must involve, there should surely be more consideration of what meanwhile is to happen to the world, which is perishing for want of peace and dying for lack of truth. If international military warfare is now recognized to be threatening the stability of civilization, such ecclesiastical warfare must surely threaten the salvation of humanity.

There is, however, another view of how this reduction of the competing bodies to only one might be effected: it is that which is based upon the analogy of evolutionary philosophy embodied in the well-known terms of "the struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest." It is painfully obvious that organized Christianity is having a struggle to exist. The prevalence of doubt, serious or slothful; the attacks of materialistic science and destructive criticism; the concern for economic emancipation and the rebellion against sex restrictions; the change in social customs and the effects of many types of employment; these are all combining to detach great masses of the people successively from public worship, private devotion, and personal faith. If these processes are not soon arrested, many of the Churches will be eventually crushed out under their pressure. It might, however, be calculated that those bodies which have the longest history behind them will survive

the longest; which will tell in favor of Catholicism. And to the confirmation of this hypothesis there is contributed the factor of comparative productivity, where Catholics, for various reasons, tend to outnumber Protestants. There are therefore many careful observers, not entirely guided by their own predilections, who predict that, within a few hundred years, there will only be one Church left standing, and that the Roman Catholic. It must simply be noted at this point that to many this state of things would seem equivalent to the entire elimination of pure Christianity, and, to others, only the retreat of a beleaguered garrison to the last citadel, where it must perish by surrender or starvation: for while to some critics of Christianity Roman Catholicism represents the only logical form of Christianity, this constitutes its sufficient refutation, since they believe Roman Catholicism will never be accepted by mankind. Even if there could be found many Roman Catholics who would welcome the operations of the "survival of the fittest" process, since they believe that it would eliminate all others and make them masters of the situation, so that Christianity, thus freed from heretical admixture and confusing rivalries, could then issue forth unembarrassed to conquer the world, they might be asked to consider, what is an ascertainable and surely symptomatic fact, that the great majority of converts to Roman Catholicism

are gained from other Christian bodies, rather than directly from the indifferent, the unbelieving, or perhaps even the heathen.

The simple disappearance of any of the non-Roman Catholic bodies would, in the present state of affairs, be no real gain to Roman Catholicism; and surely, apart from a few fanatics whose opinion we need not here consider, the disappearance of any one of the great Christian divisions (divisions though they lamentably are), Roman, Greek, Lutheran, Anglican, Nonconformist, we can hope all the rest would recognize as an unmitigated disaster. It is only where the writer can count upon a general agreement with this estimate that it is worth while asking for his vision of a reunited Church to be considered; for it seems at least to him that any other alternative spells either futility or tragedy, which cannot be our Lord's will for the world.

The vision of the reunited Church which the writer has in view is, however, neither a mere federation of existing bodies, nor of a Church simply reduced, by whatever process, to one type, but rather of a Church containing many of our existing diversities, but embraced in a unity which would be recognized by all to be a fulfilment of our Lord's purpose and prayer for His Church. Further details of such a vision must be given before it can be accepted as possible or desirable, but this can be postponed until we have considered the fact that such a predic-

tion seems to be confirmed by a movement already in process. To reveal the tendencies of this movement we must, however, first classify the existing Christian communions in such a way as to reduce them to a few main types; for despite their considerable number and great diversity, it seems possible not only thus to classify them, but to observe the actual process of their being reduced to about five main varieties. Two of these stand on the Catholic, and two on the Protestant, side of this fundamental division; and one professedly endeavors to bridge it. In this order they are (1) the Roman Catholics, (2) the Greek Orthodox, (3) the Orthodox Protestant bodies, (4) the other Protestant bodies, and (5) the Anglicans. With the Greek Orthodox group there must be included those which are regarded as heretical but which have retained Catholic Orders. The "other Protestant bodies" embrace those who have either rejected the sacraments or doctrines considered essential by the main Protestant bodies; there may be instanced as in the one category such bodies as the Salvation Army and the Society of Friends, and as in the other, the Unitarians and other small communities, while the Christian Scientists would be considered unsatisfactory under both heads.

In exposition of this preliminary classification it must further be noted that, if a certain type of government, doctrine, and worship be taken as the standard (which no ultimate question is at the mo-

ment prejudiced by identifying with the Roman), then we have a radiating defection from this standard, in which centrality of government, the retention of Catholic Orders, the adherence to the historic Creeds, and the observance of the Sacraments are all successively abandoned. For purposes of keeping these facts in mind we may represent them under the figure of a spiral; for the differing types, as we have tried to classify them, are nowhere divided by a widely sundering gap, but have intervening connecting types. For instance, the Greek system has parted with the Pope, but it not only acknowledges the first seven Councils, the seven Sacraments, the Creeds, with a minor difference, and the ancient order of bishop, priest, and deacon, but retains such a position as Œcumenical Patriarch. While the Anglican Communion approximates sporadically to the Greek system, we find in some Lutheran Churches survivals of Episcopacy and remnants of others beside the two Sacraments. Although in the other Reformed Churches the Historic Episcopate has disappeared, the bishop remains, though not in name, under the Presbyterian theory of the Eldership, while some shadow of the office is continued under the titles of Bishop, Moderator, or Superintendent in the Methodist, Congregationalist, and Baptist systems respectively. And all these systems, while parting with the name and theory of the priesthood, maintain a ministry in whose hands, if only by courtesy

and for convenience, authoritative teaching and administration of the Sacraments remain. On a similar fashion sacramental doctrine exhibits a gradual recession from transubstantiation through consubstantiation, receptionism, virtualism, and memorialism, until we come to denominations like the Salvation Army and the Society of Friends, the one having abandoned the Sacraments from expediency, and the other from conviction; for while the Friends hold that Christianity calls for no such rites, it yet substitutes for them a sacramental theory of all life. The gradual decline from the Œcumenical Creeds to denominational confessions and then to no creed at all marks a similar movement. From the fact that some gradual and connected figure like a spiral alone represents the existing situation, it is arguable that the centrifugal movement which has taken this shape may at last spend itself and give way to a centripetal reversion, which may wind itself again more closely round the center without entirely parting with its spiral form. Moreover, such a reversing movement can be discerned as actually taking place.

If we can venture so far to trust this image for the sake of the facts it seems to symbolize and the hopes it seems to sanction, we can now dispense with it, and face the objections which from many sides will be raised against the possibility or the desirability of any such recentralizing movement.

We must first, however, deal with those who will

find in this somewhat mechanical symbol only too clear evidence of a way of looking at things which they regard as alien to the Christian spirit, which to their judgment, if to be free, must function only as an organism, or be as spontaneous as the wind. But by way of defense it can be pointed out that our Scriptures employ more than one metaphor for the Church: not only a body, but a building; not only a bride, but a rock; not only a tree, but a fold; not only an army, but a city set on a hill, or with walls and gates. It seems, therefore, sanctionable to seek analogies from any sphere and from life around us. There is, however, an influential and constantly expressed opinion that the Church of Christ consists of individuals known only for certain to God, who can never be organized, because it is beyond the power of any devisable test to discern who are living members of that Church. It may at once be admitted as a fact, which Catholics and Protestants agree in recognizing, that who are the elect, the saved, the vitally united to Christ, no one knows but God; they may be safely reckoned as being inside and outside all Church organizations. Most, however, will admit that, for the production of such persons, some kind of organization which is responsible for evangelizing, instructing, gathering together for worship, and administering the Sacraments, has been, is, and always will be necessary. This necessity, however, various minds will differingly estimate as a

divine appointment or a purely human necessity, and then perhaps a regrettable necessity. But however much some may dislike the inevitable burden, complication, and stiffness which organization brings, they must admit not only its necessity, but that it is one which any attempt to dispense with has only proved impossible, while the tendency forced upon us by modern life is evermore towards organization and centrality. It is surely conceivable that if the Word could assume a body, the Spirit can construct and control an organization. The transition from organism to organization is not here made unconsciously or attempted surreptitiously. To call the Church of Christ a body is after all only a metaphor. It is not exactly or merely like a body. It must have what we now commonly call an organization, and that organization must be capable of sanctification, or human redemption must stop short of practical effect just where it is most needed. The vision, therefore, of an organized Church with a centralized authority is not to be ruled out, and need not be only grudgingly admitted as a necessary evil; it may be the sacrament of the ideal and invisible Church, and in being made that is itself invested with sanctity. Therefore the organization and government of the Church of Christ may not be even an indifferent matter, but must be both essential and unique.

Let us look again at the subject from the point of view of worship. After centuries of experiment in

what are called freer forms of worship, the increasing tendency is to return, however slowly, to the older forms, whether in liturgy, sacrament, or ceremony. The truth is, not merely that the spontaneity of what were hailed as great spiritual movements tends to die down and cannot be revived at will, but the freedom claimed for the newer experiments often means freedom only for the leader of worship, and imposes upon everyone else a bondage that has ended in boredom. Whereas liturgical worship, where the common worshiper is rightly instructed in its purpose, leaves that worshiper free, within a guiding framework of carefully prepared and widely representative prayer, to insert his own prayers, and indeed to lift his heart to the higher realms of prayer where words are unnecessary and overpassed. Sacramental worship goes further: it creates a special, or signalizes a perpetual presence, and by the wider appeal that symbols have over words, and especially by its use of silence, guided only by movement, it leaves room for and induces the very highest form of devotion. It is obvious that there is a growing sacramental hunger, often manifesting itself in unexpected places, and that hunger is as sound and sacred as was the hunger for the Incarnation, and in Christianity has been as divinely provided. As the Sacrament comes to be used with greater frequency and reverence, both the discernment of what it is, and the concern that it shall be valid, will gain

ground; that is, every means will be taken to show that it is the Sacrament that is sought and intended.

Any movement towards doctrinal agreement may seem to be more seriously hindered, since, on the one hand, the demand for radical revision of historic doctrines has become insistent and, on the other, there is a disinclination for exact definition, it being widely held that religion is quite different from theology, and the Divine is inexpressible. But in principle there is nothing in these attitudes which is inconsistent with the Catholic idea of dogma. No Catholic would for a moment hold that religion and theology are the same thing. But it is an erroneous assumption that the people do not want doctrine; everywhere they are asking for clear-cut teaching; and the Roman Church expressly claims its competence to define more clearly, as the need arises, the doctrines which are of faith. It only needs to be acknowledged on all sides that dogma has only a safeguarding and yet sacramental significance: it protects and protests against onesided insistence and explanations that only explain things away; it does not add anything to the facts of revelation; it only clarifies them by more concrete expressions. If only it is remembered that what is at the heart of the dogma must be sought in experience, or (to use less ambiguous and less hackneyed language) in the experiment of living and the exploration of devotion, it will more easily be distinguished what is the purpose

of dogma. It is not therefore inconceivable that it may be gradually discovered that what is really most needed to-day is a right understanding of the need of dogma; a recognition that Christian dogma only dogmatically keeps open the way of freedom and advance; and therefore that a living, progressing true Church must possess dogmatic authority.

These reflections are conditioned partly by the actual facts of a gradually developing situation, and partly by the writer's hopes that they will continue to develop in the same direction. It is believed that the centrifugal movement has spent its strength, and first in organization, then in worship, and lastly in doctrine a centripetal movement is now setting in. The Reunited Church is therefore a vision of what it is believed lies not far beyond the horizon, and can be seen by anyone who will only take a wide enough view and look steadily at all the facts actually visible.

But this brings us within sight of the main difficulty hindering the realization of that vision. Despite this centralizing movement in government, worship, and doctrine, which, however slow, is indisputable, the Churches that have broken away from the Roman obedience declare they will never return to it; while the Roman authorities not only insist ever more firmly upon submission to the Roman See as divinely prescribed, and refuse any ecclesiastical status to bodies separated from it, but in their most recent pronouncements seem to imply that this re-

turning movement is essentially inadequate, that no negotiations with any of the separated bodies can ever be entered upon, and that the obvious duty of all enlightened Christians is to sever their connections with these bodies and seek admission to the only body that possesses ecclesiastical status.

It should first be recognized that the charge of intransigeance lies equally against either side in this dispute. The return to Roman obedience, as at present defined, is declared to be unthinkable by those who are separated from it, and equally strongly do the Roman authorities declare that no terms can be discussed with rebellious bodies. There are, however, two purely practical considerations that operate to stiffen the situation to an apparent deadlock. The one is that there is an enormous and inhibiting fear amongst those other bodies as to what might be the consequence of submitting to Rome; a fear complicated no doubt by prejudice, hate, and pride, but nevertheless not without some historical ground; which, even if baseless, needs to be, and might be, dissipated. If we try to analyze this fear we shall find that it is of three different kinds: there is the fear that if Rome ever becomes again the dominant and recognized religious system persecutions will inevitably be revived; secondly, there is the fear of political dictation; and, thirdly, there is the fear that free inquiry will be suppressed. It would be a difficult and lengthy business to justify these fears in

such a way as to convince some Roman apologists that they were genuine, or have any grounds in history. When such charges are made it is at once responded that Protestants have also employed persecution; and although it might be disputed by either side which has been the worse in this respect, it can be pointed out that proscriptions against Catholics have only recently been lifted in this country, and in this or that matter, such as the Coronation oath, still remain. It is true that Protestants have persecuted, and some, no doubt, still would; but the general temper of Protestantism, for whatever reasons, is now opposed to persecution on principle, and would certainly never resort to the cruel and fatal penalties of the past; whereas, up to quite recent times, Roman apologists have either defended the historical persecutions as not condemned by the spirit of the age in which they occurred, or have defended the right to persecute on principle, though expressing their belief that in modern circumstances persecution would never be resorted to. But the reply that Protestants also have persecuted or that the custom of the age sanctioned it, does not relieve the subject of its odium; for the modern mind will object that the true Church ought to have taken a higher course than those condemned as *the* sectarians, and should have persisted in its original protest against the State persecution of religious opinions, instead of actually making use of it. Moreover, it must be pointed out

that this objection to persecution is not necessarily based upon indifference to religious truth. It may be made when there is the conviction that there is but one true faith; for it can be held that the true faith should be in this wise distinguished from all others, and can only be sincerely attained by any soul so long as it is not under any kind of coercion or threat of fear. Fortunately distinguished Roman apologists and historians now admit the evil and mistake of persecution, and the new Canon Law tacitly omits the old obligation of the Church to "persecute" the heretic; but an authoritative pronouncement which could not be rescinded is necessary if all grounds for this fear are to be removed.

Without going into the second ground of fear at the same length (for the same objections and replies apply there also) similar distinctions must be recognized on both sides as actuating the resentment against political domination by religious authority. If Protestants would admit that the Church has the right and, indeed, the divine command to discipline the nations, to rebuke kings, and condemn corporate as well as individual sins, and the Catholic would admit that this must only be by way of exhortation, and any attempt on the part of the Church as such to employ political pressure be authoritatively repudiated, a further cause of misunderstanding and confusion would be cleared up.

The question of free inquiry is more difficult, and

it is not easy to define, to the satisfaction of either side, the exact point at issue. But the Protestant has at least a feeling that certain issues are really determined from the beginning, because the results must agree with traditional opinions. On the other hand, the Catholic can rightly claim that if negative conclusions are reached about, say, the existence of God, the Divinity of Christ, or the founding of the Church, they must be denounced as obviously wrong. But it could be made much clearer to disputants on both sides than it apparently is, that the final appeal must lie absolutely with fact and truth; and while there are other things than earthly facts and other faculties beside reason, all facts must be admitted as such, and within its own province reason must rule. It is more a question of attitude that is here at issue, and much fear would be relieved if it were not only more dogmatically stated that actual scientific facts must not be resisted nor rational logic contradicted, but that free inquiry into the whole of the Church's faith and claims is not only allowed, but invited and encouraged, and the more ungrudgingly because it is believed that the Church can stand such inquiry, and that such inquiry is an essential prelude to a rightly grounded faith.

The Roman claims to supremacy and obedience are generally regarded by both sides as the crux of the whole situation; but the present writer is of the opinion that subsidiary things are hindering influ-

ence, and if these could be first cleared up, the way would then be open to a freer consideration of the Roman claims, unprejudiced by the fear that if once these were admitted, they would only be used to extend them to illegitimate areas, and to cover really alien concomitants. It is surely no longer beyond hope to look for a general admittance that some unique responsibility was committed to St. Peter, and that, to be of any value, this must have carried with it the power to transmit the same to his successors; and where can we look for any historic fulfilment of that but in the Papacy. It is also surely not too much to ask that its defenders should admit that historically the power of the Papacy has been illegitimately extended to other realms. Some irrevocable guarantee could be given that the Papacy would be administered in the Petrine spirit, and be equally open, where necessary, to a Pauline rebuke, without that being accompanied by threats of defection on the one side, or the reprisal of excommunication on the other. Whether the great reconciliation can be by corporate negotiation, or must be by individual submission, the present writer holds that a series of such pronouncements and assurances would hasten it enormously. Catholics often complain that they are misunderstood, but they can little know how the arguments they employ, the kind of approach they make, the very language they use, and often the tone they assume, erects an unnecessary

barrier, and only manufactures fear, repulsion, and a complete misunderstanding. Even the heathen must be addressed in their own language, and Protestants must not only be treated likewise, but it might be remembered that many of them are devout lovers of our Lord, are virtuous, pious and saintly, earnestly desire to do nothing but His will, and are increasingly concerned for the confusions and divisions of Christendom.

Nevertheless, some consideration must be given to the question whether anything can be done along the lines of corporate reunion. It must be admitted that there is a practical difficulty here on both sides. Even if the Roman Catholic authorities were willing to open negotiations, it would be difficult to know with which body to begin, and where they would be dealing with an authority equally able to answer for or pledge its own Communion. Yet even corporations move, and some are already moving nearer to the central position, and the day may come when such negotiations will be possible, and the supreme Roman authority may take advantage of the opportunity. But meantime, much difficulty seems to be unnecessarily created by pronouncements not only that the Roman Church can never consent to negotiate with such bodies, but that any meeting together of those who are anxious to explore such possibilities, or to find the cause of disunion, is futile. It may be as salutary as it is necessary to point out that no final

union is thinkable unless it is to be based upon an acceptance of the full historic faith of the Church; but it might be remembered, in all charity, that whether they have been corrupted by wrong teaching, confused by discordant authorities, or prejudiced by alien accompaniments or false conclusions of the faith, those formally heretical need not be heretics in heart, and those judged to be schismatic need not be entirely responsible for their present position. A notorious hindrance is certainly to be found in what seems to many the intolerant exclusiveness which grants them no lot or part in the Church of Christ. This of course arises inevitably from the claim that the Roman Communion is co-terminous with the true Church. Is it quite useless to hope that one day there will be a less rigid and relentless exposition of that claim? If it came to be admitted by Protestants that there can be but one Church of Christ, and that its unity must be visible, could it not also be admitted by Catholics that the first essential is union with Christ, which is not necessarily guaranteed by membership in the visible Church, and may be attained by some without it? And since it is granted that outside the Roman Communion there are those to whom the name of Christian cannot be denied, when they gather together to worship Christ or seek His will, may not some measure of His presence and guidance be granted to them? In short, the Churchmanship of such Christians may be im-

perfect and incomplete, but surely they are not so far removed from Christ as unbelievers and the heathen, and should not be treated as if they were either insincere pretenders or altogether beyond the brotherhood. The way in which communion with Rome as alone constituting the unity of the Church is sometimes expounded only shocks others together in loyalty to the communities to which they owe so much, and which, however mistakenly, they love, because they regard them as part of the Body of Christ; and such pronouncements strike them as, if not arrogant, then blind to facts, when there is at the same time no admission that historical circumstances and abuses account for schisms, for which the fault is not wholly on one side.

There is a further reason why some recognition of the Christian standing of corporate bodies might be looked for. Some of the Christian denominations have developed a national, and others a vocational, character. Without asking for any sanction of the idea that there can be merely national or, in any exclusive sense, racial Churches, it is an obvious fact that members of a Church which speak the same tongue, owe the same national allegiance, or share the same culture, have not only a bond but a difference from others, which must have some recognition and be given room for expression. Even if all Christians should preferably use the same language for their central act of worship, no one would de-

mand this for their hymns, or their popular devotions. It is admitted that there must be allowances for local customs, and a special training for the clergy of different nations. National patriotism need not conflict with a genuine Catholic internationalism, and indeed the one can be fostered only the better to contribute to the other. So much can be perhaps taken to be conceded beforehand, though in the past it has not always been observed; and even in the present the character of the centralized Roman government must seem to some nations strangely alien while it can be criticized as of too predominantly national a complexion adequately to represent a universal Church.

But there remains a further recognition which might be safely granted to denominational specialization. It is a fact which may be regarded as at least providentially used that different denominations have made a special appeal to certain classes of the community. Some are peculiarly able to evangelize the masses, others to appeal to the thoughtful, others to provide for the interiorly illuminated. Need it be thought incredible or deemed undesirable that this differentiation might, at least for a time, continue; of course, with their leaders in doctrinal agreement and complete loyalty to the central authority, and yet specializing upon the evangelistic, the ethical, or the rational appeal? For masses of the people are far away from any possibility of understanding, say, the

Mass; they are not sure about God, or Christ, or the Church, yet. Many of them would probably enter no Church at all, because they are afraid of the influence of a ritual service or the atmosphere of a Catholic building. Is it not necessary for them to have a long training and a gradual introduction before they are ready to enter upon the full inheritance of Catholic faith and are fit to take part with spiritual profit in Catholic worship? There is obviously still a desire, and always a need for the preaching in which some denominations have specialized. Granted that that preaching was firmly founded on the fully accepted Catholic faith, might there not be granted such room for it as would not be possible at a ritual office, Eucharistic worship, or within the buildings where these took place.

Other denominations, again, have developed and found great help in classes for mutual edification, testimony, and prayer, and in that combination of silence and spontaneity, which the Quaker meeting preëminently sets forth. These might surely still exist, not in contradiction or competition with the Church's ancient forms, but as valuable complements to and commentaries upon them, as well as much needed preparation for them.

In this vision of the Reunited Church there would therefore continue those denominational differences to which we have been now long accustomed, and which have obviously served some real need; yet no

longer existing in division, rivalry or hostility, but coördinated so as to serve the vast variety of human nature, with its differing dispositions, stages of growth, levels of spiritual appropriation; these however no longer treated as static and intractable, but graded like the classes in a school; the teachers working towards an agreed end, accredited for their particular task, yet acknowledging the necessity of the whole curriculum and submitting to the direction of the competent and appointed authority.

This allowance for a graded variation and a coordinated difference would then have the advantage of preparing people for the supreme mysteries of the faith by a gradual initiation; for it is surely clear that Catholic worship is at present, not only shutting people out who cannot understand it, and yet condemning all other worship as unauthorized and inadequate, but is also shutting in many whose attendance at it is due merely to fear or custom, and whose worship therefore inevitably tends to become superstitious or formal. What an appreciation the Salvationist would bring to the Mysteries of the Mass when he understood that here was ministered the "Blood and Fire" whose praises he had so often sung; what love of the Personal Redeemer present in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar would be awakened in the Methodist who had been long familiar with the intimate devotion of Wesley's hymns; and what understanding of the mystical significance

of Communion would be permitted the Quaker long trained in the silence of the Friends' Meeting! If men could come from the free discussion of the Adult School to the worship of High Mass, each would guide and illuminate the other; and those who had known the opportunities and discipline of the Congregationalist Church Meeting would bring some idea to Catholicism of how God works through minds freely conferring together.

The Papacy would remain, more than ever needed, but with wider views of man's needs; guiding and directing a vast organization, but with allowance for the freedom and variety that anything so vast must embrace; advising, empowering, commissioning; issuing from time to time authoritative declarations as to the explication and implications of the faith; and content to let those authoritative declarations stand alongside all inadequate, erroneous or eccentric expositions, without the addition of anathemas or recourse to excommunications; the Catholic Church full of faith in the power of truth to win the victory, but no longer having any faith in threats or penalties; and therefore free at last from the appeal to false fear without; and equally free from the false fear within, that ever since the Reformation has so limited and restricted Roman policy; a free Church preaching to all mankind the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

Here, then, is a vision whose actuality seems pre-

dictable from existing facts, where variety need not be inconsistent with the historic Faith and Order of the Catholic Church, the realization of which seems possible without too violently reversing development or abolishing established customs, if only time would be left for a gradual approach and a deepening understanding, and deep-seated fears could be dissipated by frank admissions concerning the abuses of the past and authoritative assurances concerning the future. It would then be clear what is sought, who is calling, and what makes us welcome—the Church, obviously Christ's Body, absolutely obedient to its Divine Head, indisputably His Bride, radiantly beautiful with His holiness, calling men with that voice which needed not to strive or cry aloud, exhibiting all the humility of that Heart which was meek and lowly, and opening its arms as wide as He, Who declared that none who came to Him would ever be cast out.

TRUTH AND THE FAITH:

An Interpretation of Christianity

by HARTLEY BURR ALEXANDER

For some time Professor Alexander has been saying that the logical-mathematical approach to truth is faulty, that truth arrived at by that way is fragmentary and distorted. A fully satisfied understanding, he holds, can come only through deeper and more complex insights. To him, as his book will bear witness, religion is just such a complexification of insight as will enable men to see life whole.

This book, then, is the record of a man's thinking about religion. The author invites to its reading only those who share his concern for religious truth. For religion, he thinks, is less the domain of the specialist than any other field; of religion, each man speaks without prerogative.

In this timely reinterpretation of Christianity, Professor Alexander reveals himself as a mystic, impatient with mere reason, and quite too latitudinarian to be welcome in most of theological Christendom.

His beautiful prose has been characterized by Clarence Britten, in the *New York Evening Post,* as "velvet eloquence and precious lace, jeweled imagery and diaphanous veils." Joseph Fort Newton said of him that "he has what the musicians call 'touch.' The whole book has a lyric quality that is lovely and often thrilling."

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, INCORPORATED
ONE PARK AVENUE NEW YORK

RELIGION

by EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES

"This book endeavors to present certain aspects of religion as they appear in the light of its history and of social psychology. Religion is here viewed as a natural, social, cultural process. The *doctrines,* which have often been regarded as the essence of religion, are seen to have ultimate relation to the religious *activities,* being at once deposits or products and also instruments of such activities. Religion arises as a phase or quality of the complex life of the human spirit in its idealistic out-reach, and is continually subject to restatement under the influence of the flowing stream of that life."

From the Author's Preface.

"A new species within the historical succession of philosophies of religion."

GEORGE ALBERT COE.

"Perhaps the most important book on religion published in America for the past year . . . distinctly the most persuasive and enlightening document which the humanistic school has produced."

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN.

"Here is one who has passed through the religious and moral unsettlement in which so many are struggling, and has come out on the other side where there is peace and understanding."

HENRY NELSON WIEMAN.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, INCORPORATED
ONE PARK AVENUE NEW YORK

MIRACLE IN HISTORY AND IN MODERN THOUGHT: *or,* MIRACLE AND CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC

by C. J. WRIGHT

This scholarly work is first of all an endeavor to defend the truths inherent in the concept of the supernatural. "In the stress and tension of our theological 'civil wars,' " writes the author, "it is unfortunately easy to forget our main antagonist, represented by a finally materialistic view of life and of the universe. I have sought . . . to be faithful to an emphasis which refuses to forget this fact."

It is an endeavor also to show that the miracle concept as propounded and defended in the main body of apologetic during the past centuries is entirely inacceptable in the light of modern knowledge.

The author has been unable to divorce a study of miracle from the study of specific miracles. He attempts to bring Christian apologetic into harmony with the *consensus* of competent judgment on historical issues.

Dr. Wright treats the problem of miracle first historically, than theologically, and next philosophically. Documented with careful scholarship, this treatise guides the reader through the difficult evidence surrounding a perplexing enigma of religious history.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, INCORPORATED
ONE PARK AVENUE NEW YORK

SOCIAL SOURCES OF DENOMINATIONALISM

by H. Richard Niebuhr

An attempt to describe the social character of the denominations. Its thesis is that the causes of schism have always been dominantly sociological rather than theological; that the most important characteristic of any sect or church is its cultural type, not its theology or its polity.

Economic, racial, sectional, and nationalist groups, says the author, have adapted the gospel to their own peculiar needs and points of view, and accordingly have reinterpreted doctrine, accommodated ethics, and modified polity. Hence the churches are described not as Catholic, Lutheran, Baptist, Calvinist, but as churches of the disinherited, as churches of the bourgeoisie, as sectional, national, and racial organizations.

Differences of doctrine, polity, and piety are traced to these social roots.

Since much historical material is used for illustration, the book may be described as a social history of the major denominations. Or, it might be called a critical account of the secularization of Christianity.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, INCORPORATED
ONE PARK AVENUE NEW YORK

DATE DUE

BX
8
.A1
M3

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BX8.A1 M3
Marchant, Jam The reunion of Christendom
3 0645 0003 5952 7